













THE



QUARTERLY REVIEW.



VOL. 137.

PUBLISHED IN

*JULY & OCTOBER, 1874.*



*L O N D O N:*

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1874.

052024  
Vol. 137 (P)

Uttarpore Jaikrishna Public Library  
Accon No. 6432 Date 19.3.78

---

LONDON:

Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS, Stamford Street,  
and Charing Cross.

---

# CONTENTS

OF

No. 274.

ART.	Page
I.—Der Jesuiten-Orden. Von Dr. J. Huber. Berlin, 1873	283
II.—1. Travels in Little Known Parts of Asia Minor. By the Rev. Henry J. Van Lonnep, D.D., thirty years Missionary in Turkey. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1870.	
2. Commercial and other Reports, received at the Foreign Office from Her Majesty's Consuls, &c., in Turkey, during the Years 1867-72. London - - -	313
III.—History of the Modern Styles of Architecture. By James Fergusson, D.C.L., F.R.S. Second Edition. London, 1873 - - - - -	354
IV.—1. Sartor Resartus. By Thomas Carlyle. Popular Edition. London, 1871.	
2. Latter-day Pamphlets. By the Same. Popular Edition. London, 1871.	
3. Culture and Anarchy. By Matthew Arnold, D.C.L. London, 1870.	
4. Literature and Dogma. By the Same. London, 1873.	
5. St. Paul and Protestantism. By the Same. London, 1869.	
6. Studies of the Greek Poets. By J. A. Symonds. London, 1873.	
7. Essays on the Renaissance. By W. H. Pater. London, 1873 - - - - -	389
V.—La Vie d'un Patricien de Venise au Seizième Siècle. Les Doges—La Charte Ducale—Les Femmes à Venise—L'Université de Padoue—Les Préliminaires de Lépante, &c., d'après les Papiers d'Etat des Archives de Venise. Par Charles Yriarte. Paris, 1874 - - - - -	416
VI.—Life of John Coleridge Patteson, Missionary Bishop of the Melanesian Islands. By Charlotte Mary Yonge. In two volumes. London, 1874 - -	458

ART.	Page
VII.—1. The English Peasantry. By Francis George Heath. London, 1874.	
2. The Seven Ages of a Village Pauper. By George C. T. Bartley. London, 1874.	
3. The Revolt of the Field. By Arthur Clayden. London, 1874.	
4. Murray's Handbook of the Eastern Counties. London, 1870 - - - - -	493
VIII.—Worthies of All Souls; Four Centuries of English History illustrated from the College Archives. By Montagu Burrows, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of All Souls. London, 1874 - - - - -	514
IX.—1. Tables of the Number of Criminal Offenders, 1841– 1855.	
2. Judicial Statistics, 1856–1873.	
3. Correspondence on the Subject of the late Disturbances in the Manufacturing and Mining Districts. Edited by Rev. John Sinclair. 1842 - - - - -	526
X.—1. Six Judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. By W. G. Brooke, M.A. London, \ 1872.	
2. Legal Ritual. By J. M. Dalo. London, 1871.	
3. An Act for the Regulation of Public Worship, 1874	542
Note upon the Article 'Primitive Man—Tylor and Lubbock,' in No. 273 - - - - -	587

# THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

ART. I.—*Der Jesuiten-Orden.* Von Dr. J. Huber. Berlin, 1873.

THERE is hardly a phenomenon in History more deserving of investigation than that presented by the body of men termed Jesuits, who, though from the very day of their institution an object of suspicion in many powerful quarters, and repeatedly of sharp proscription, have, nevertheless, asserted such enduring influence as to have become credited in popular fancy with the mysterious possession of a subtle faculty like that whereby some vegetable fibres contrive to defy extirpation. Barely a century has elapsed since the promulgation of the Bull, through which it was confidently anticipated that Clement XIV. had at last laid the spirit of this occult force under the supreme spell of Pontifical exorcism; and public curiosity finds itself still drawn with unabated keenness to speculate, as it did then, on what can possibly be the vital principle feeding the rank growth to which the Society has again attained. Just as was the case a hundred years ago, the public is beset with publications about the Jesuits, varying in character from narratives worked up in the true Titus Oates colours to disquisitions bristling with learned quotations and counter-quotations. In the sharply-rolling fire of this controversy—due at the present moment to the stringent measures which Germany has deemed it incumbent on herself to enact against the Order of Jesus—both parties show themselves equally strenuous; and, if we are treated to some writings disfigured by a credulity that would still gravely adduce the ‘*Monita Secreta*’ as a genuine document, so also do we encounter rejoinders marked by a redundancy of declamation, in which the argument is made to converge upon the secondary and often very flimsy portions of the indictments advanced rather than upon their graver substance.

The point at issue in this hot dispute bespeaks attention on many grounds, and touches questions that practically affect serious interests. For upon the judgment arrived at in regard to the evidence brought forward will depend the question, whether

whether there can be a justification for the special sentence of outlawry which has been levelled in Germany against the Order of Jesus, on grounds which, if valid there, must likewise be deemed to hold good for a like sentence in every State. Are the Jesuit Fathers simply earnest, self-denying, devoted missionaries, who go forth only to pray, to preach, and to convert, with the fervour of souls rapt by transcendent devotion to a mystical call; servants of Christ, devoid of worldly guile and selfish interest, and whose pre-eminence over others engaged in like work is only what must be consequent on the higher degree of their single-mindedness and the intenser zeal which they carry into the labours of spiritual conversion? Will it be pronounced, as the result of careful consideration, that only a visionary alarm, due to the sickly humours of morbid suspicion or the inventive spirit of calumny, can allege against the Society any features distinct from those necessarily appertaining to every association destined to the exercise of spiritual duties and composed of men absorbed in the enthusiasm of a religious vocation? Or will the conviction force itself on candid minds, that in the constitution and practice of the Order there is really something which warrants the charge, that the Society is an Institution curiously calculated to promote principles objectionable in their general tendency, and that it might even prove in certain contingencies a corporation dangerous to the State? It is with the view of helping our readers to arrive at some opinion on these hotly-controverted matters, that the following pages are written. We are fully alive to the impossibility of giving, in our limited space, an exhaustive survey of an organisation so elaborate, and of a system so intricate, as appertain to the Jesuit Order. We must confine ourselves strictly to features at once typical and emphatically distinctive of the Society. In seeking to bring these out, we shall advance no statement that is not substantiated on authority which the Society itself would admit to be unimpeachable. At the same time we tender our acknowledgments to various publications of recent date in Germany, of which that cited in our heading deserves particular attention. Dr. Huber's name is well known for several writings relating to Church history, and has been prominently connected with the movement against Ultramontane doctrine, which has resulted in the formation of an Old Catholic congregation. No book furnishes in so popular a form an equally comprehensive account of the Order. It is therefore to be regretted that Dr. Huber should not have expended on it the additional care which would have made his compilation, not merely a pleasant volume, but a trustworthy handbook. We protest

protest against the habit either of not giving authorities, or of giving them at second-hand, and often incorrectly; while in some instances Dr. Huber has made grave allegations for which the warranty is certainly not forthcoming in the authorities named in the references at the bottom of the page.

The very special character which, from the outset, Loyola meant to impart to his Institution, was already symbolised in the title he devised for it. To have introduced his creation under a designation of the type common to existing religious communities would not have answered the Founder's intention. Loyola contemplated calling into existence an Organisation absolutely novel in character and in scope, and that fact he sought to impress on the world by a title presumptuously expressive of superior pretension. The Jesuit Fathers have ever laid stress on the point that they are not members of a Monastic Order, and in this they are justified by their exemption from all those observances as to dress and ritual, which are stringently enforced in every Monastic Profession, as well as by being expressly not comprehended in the generic designation applied by the Council of Trent to Monastic Bodies. 'Est quorundam militum societas' is the definition which the great Jesuit doctor, Suarez, gives of the body to which he belonged; and the official historian, Orlandini, distinctly says that its title, *Societas*, was adopted as most closely rendering the Spanish *Compañía*, the technical term for a body of fighting-men under the direct control of a captain. Loyola's aim was to effect an Organisation which should result in a thoroughly disciplined and mobilised body of men, moving like a highly-trained military unit at the word of command, and standing ever ready, under the proclaimed chieftainship of Jesus, to war against and smite by superior dexterity in arms the forces adverse to the absolute ascendancy of the Papal system. In his design an Institution on such a model should be more than merely one amongst various organs of the Church. It should grow into the actual embodiment of the Church militant upon earth; and, with the view of emphatically symbolising this superior scope, he conspicuously affixed to his Foundation, as a declaratory inscription, the name of the common Saviour of Mankind. The pretension involved in this attempt to monopolise so Catholic a name was instinctively perceived and strenuously resented, notably by the French clergy, then still animated with the spirit of the Gallican liberties. The Sorbonne protested against the presumptuousness implied in the claim of any particular corporation to style itself the special cohort of Jesus, and, at the Ecclesiastical Assembly at Poissy, Archbishop Du

x 2

Bellay,



Bellay, with the concurrence of his clergy, demanded that the admission of the new order into France should be conditional on a change of its objectionable title. But Paul III. had expressed the abiding instinct of the Holy See when, on perusal of Loyola's draft scheme, he exclaimed: '*Hic est digitus Dei*;' and, notwithstanding the opposition of minds that were veteran and venerable in the Church, the Order grew quickly into commanding influence under the fostering countenance of successive Popes.

The method elaborated by Loyola and his immediate companions, for securing the organisation of a rigidly disciplined and yet admirably pliant body of ecclesiastical warriors, is a theme on which many writers have dilated. It is indeed impossible to consider the series of '*Regulations*' and '*Constitutions*,'—of minute injunctions and astute exemptions,—which make up the code of the Society, without becoming greatly impressed with the forethought and sagacity which could devise provisions so intricate and so nicely dovetailed. The law-makers of the Society have framed a set of ordinances and of privileges with skill that is perfectly marvellous. On the one hand, they supply every conceivable guarantee for crushing out any germ of independent impulse that could by possibility allow momentary play in an individual member to some movement of dissent, however suppressed and strictly mental, from any order emanating from his Superior. On the other hand, they are studiously adapted to instil into those entrusted with the supreme direction of the Society a sense of discretion so vast, so ample, and so completely freed from all ordinary limitations, that they may become absolutely imbued with the consciousness of duty being wholly centred in the keen observance of whatever at any particular moment might recommend itself as specially expedient for making particular minds acquiesce more readily in their ascendancy. To this end Faculties are lodged with the supreme authority of the Order, which have no parallel in their range; while the whole plan of the extraordinarily protracted training, to which every member is subjected, has been carefully thought out with a view to the particular end of making him a thoroughly supple instrument ready at an instant to the hand of his Superior for any purpose. That powers of so vast a range might possibly be diverted by some Superior to other purposes, under dictates of personal ambition, was a danger which did not escape Loyola. No part of his organisation is more noteworthy than the chain of checks and counter-checks for keeping each organ of the system, including the highest, to the precise mark of its intended functions, so as to let it neither lag behind nor yet exceed the measure thereof. A mechanism

has,

has thus been contrived, which, while exceptionally complicated, has yet worked with noiseless smoothness—setting in action a body of forces elaborately disciplined for the attainment of distinctly specified results, under the guidance of motive powers at once steeled into inflexible rigidity as regards ultimate aims, and yet capable of Protean suppleness in the adoption of forms of procedure at the dictate of policy. The circumstantial provisions of this machinery—the dry bones of the system—have been repeatedly dissected, but nowhere better than in the chapter devoted by Dr. Huber to this interesting head of his subject. We can here merely draw attention to certain capital points, which it is essential to grasp as fundamentally characteristic of the Society of Jesus and as distinctive of its constitution from that of any confraternity of a simply devotional nature.

In the statutes and records of the Order, it is over and over again declared with emphatic solemnity, that the cardinal purpose of its labours is the promotion of God's Greater Glory; that all its powers and resources are to be devoted '*Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam.*' In a remarkable epistle to the Fathers in Portugal, to be found in every edition of the '*Institutes*,'\* St. Ignatius gave these instructions: 'Other religious associations may exceed us in fastings, in vigils, and the like rigorous observances; it behoves our brethren to be pre-eminent in true and absolute obedience, in abnegation of all individual will and judgment.' In the '*Constitutions*' it stands again written: 'Let all be convinced, that those who live under obedience are bound to let themselves be set in motion and directed by Divine Providence through the medium of their Superiors, exactly as if they were dead bodies.' In these sentences we have the quintessence of the principle whereon the Society was formed. It was meant to be the force that should break down by the sheer weight of solid pressure all elements adverse to the exaltation of God's Greater Glory; such exaltation demanding the reduction of the world to the implicit acceptance of a system culminating in the acknowledgment of an Absolute Pontiff. As the emblazonment of the name of Jesus symbolised in a speculative sense this Glory of God, so was it symbolised in the concrete by the Pope, to whose service every full member of the Order was sworn by a special vow. Yet at the same time this body-guard for the absolute authority of the

---

\* All references in this article are to the Prague edition of the '*Institutes*,' in two volumes, 1757, published by the 18th General Congregation, which contains also the Decrees of the General Congregations and the Declarations by successive Generals, which rule the constructions to be put on the text of the statutes. It is this edition that was used in the pleadings against the Jesuit Order before the French Parliaments.

Pope was curiously provided with Faculties calculated to justify its acting of its own accord for the assertion of its principles, in the event of some Pope proving unfaithful to them. It will be found that, while the General professedly figured as a mere Lieutenant holding a commission from the Pope, he was yet invested with certain Faculties in virtue whereof, in particular contingencies, he might consider himself the depositary of powers that rendered the Order exempt from the authority of an innovating Pope. The same spirit of jealous precaution is manifested in the provisions for securing the maintenance of the principles of the Society against a General who might perchance be infected with ideas not conformable to its spirit. Though invested with absolute power in everything relating to the administration of the Society, the General is yet under perpetual supervision, and, by the rules, he would forfeit his powers in certain specified contingencies. It is this chain of self-acting provisions which makes the 'Constitutions' so wonderful. The system combines in most subtle proportions the elements of Despotism, of Monarchy, of Oligarchy, and of Democracy. The fully-professed Father—who is so closely bound to obedience that he must perforce bow without murmur to any command, no matter what, which he may receive from the General—is yet quite justified in reckoning on attainment, in due course, to a position that will give him influence in the administration of the Order, provided only his capacities are adapted to the character of its labours. The General, again, who is enabled to issue at discretion instructions that must be acquiesced in implicitly by every individual member, finds himself yet perforce surrounded by persons imposed upon him by the Society, of whose presence it is not in his power to divest himself, and who are for ever by his side like shadows—inconstant spectres of admonition—that never forsake him for even the shortest interval. Finally, the Pope, who at first sight would appear to be exalted on the pinnacle of the absolute Commander of the Faithful—Lord over a host of myrmidons sworn to unmurmuring obedience to his whispered word—will be discovered, in the case of certain critical emergencies, to be hampered by limitations not very ostensible but very singular, which, whenever they should come into play, must invest the General of the Jesuits, towards him, with the character rather of a great feudal magnate, strong in chartered rights, than of a mere captain in command of a body-guard in the pay of an absolute prince. By what elaborate provisions it has been possible for Loyola and his immediate partners to effect the blending of elements seemingly so incongruous into the production of an Institution which, while outwardly fashioned!

fashioned into the monotonous aspect of a cast-iron phalanx, possesses the most curious aptitudes for instantly falling into the loosest skirmishing order—this it is that we now shall proceed to illustrate from the ‘Institutes’ of the Society, the Privileges recorded in Papal Bulls, the Decrees of General Congregations, and the authoritative Declarations given by its Generals.

It is matter of notoriety that there are various grades in the Order, and that the conditions surrounding the primary admission and the gradual advancement of the members constitute cardinal features in its organisation. It would only bewilder the reader were we to give a catalogue (and within our space it could be but a catalogue) of the intricate series of subdivisions and removes which make up the gradations through which a Jesuit may be made to pass. To grasp the peculiar significance of these intermediate steps, for the purposes of test or reward, would need an amount of explanation which we cannot here afford. It is enough for the general reader to hold fast the fact, that the vast Organisation known as the Society of Jesus is composed of a body of men falling practically into three great divisions:—first, the division of Probationers, comprising an infinity of various sub-grades, to some of which are attached important trusts, but having this characteristic in common, that they are not connected as grades with any *solemn* profession of vows:—secondly, the division of Fathers who have made profession of the *three* vows:—and thirdly, the veterans of the Order, the select Fathers who have been proved worthy of admission to the innermost circle of the initiated, the Fathers who have made profession of the *four* vows. By the statutes, no one under fourteen years of age can become a Novice. Once admitted as such, which depends on the absolute discretion of the Superiors, the Novice is systematically subjected to a most rigid probationship, extending necessarily over a number of years, and in which advancement or non-advancement through the various stages is again wholly dependent on the opinion formed by the Superiors as to his qualifications. Assuming that he bears himself to their satisfaction, the aspirant will ultimately be permitted to make profession of the three vows, namely, of obedience, chastity, and poverty. It is perplexing to meet with special mention of these vows at this point, as they have been apparently exacted at earlier stages. The explanation is that all previous vows constitute mere moral engagements taken towards God, which strictly bind the individual *in foro conscientia*, without however involving any contract that possesses a bilateral force. Thus, by his vows, the Probationer binds himself indeed to absolute obedience towards the General for as long as the latter may see fit to command him (for the General

(General can dismiss him at pleasure), without acquiring in return a particle of rights in the Society.

To all intents and purposes the Probationer is no more than the bondsman of the Order from the day he crosses its threshold ; having renounced, on his part, every shred of individual liberty, while, on the other part, nothing whatsoever is guaranteed him beyond admission to a course of trial. The Jesuit who has made solemn profession of the three vows is, however, in this improved position, that his expulsion can no longer happen at the mere individual whim of the General without the concurrence of the principal officers of the Order, a proviso that is practically but of nominal value. If advancement up to this stage has been surrounded with arduous conditions, it is yet more difficult to obtain admission into that choice class which constitutes the core of the Order. No Jesuit is to attain this supreme degree under the age of forty-five ; consequently, if he became a Novice at the earliest legal period, he must perforce have passed thirty-one years in subordinate grades, however admirable his qualifications may be. The Father is required at this stage to renew the solemn profession of his former vows, to which is now added a vow imposed on no other Order—the vow of special obedience to the Pope, at whose word the Jesuit binds himself instantly to go forth on whatever errand it may please the Holy Father to command. The Fathers who have sworn this oath compose what may be called the Old Guard of the Order. It has been calculated that not more than two per cent. amongst the received members of the Order come to be deemed worthy of admission to this supreme grade.

If we now consider the mechanism regulating the action of this complicated body, we find ourselves in presence of a no less curiously contrived system of provisions to ensure the closest check and supervision at every turn and point, in combination with the vastest possible faculties for elastic play in the mainwheel of the machinery. Through the medium of the General Congregation—comprising Elect Fathers, and particularly the high dignitaries called Provincials—the Order appoints certain members to be constant attendants on the General, who, while possessed of the entire patronage as regards every other nomination—including the Provincials—is wholly debarred from a voice in regard to these. The individuals thus holding commissions directly from the Order are the Assistants, four in number, each being the representative of a nation ; the Admonisher, a dignitary sworn by special oath never to lose sight of the General, whom he is intended to dog at every step, like the personification of a pursuing conscience ; and the Confessor, at whose

whose hands the General, when falling back occasionally into the conditions of ordinary humanity, seeks to be shriven. The General is besides bound by stringent vows never to take up his residence anywhere but in Rome, and never to stay from home, even though only for a night, except in company with a Father Assistant. He is likewise not at liberty to abdicate his office, which once accepted he is bound to hold on in deference to the Order, without the consent of which he is also debarred from accepting any preferment or dignity. It is even within the competency of the Order, in specified cases, through appointed organs, to suspend and depose a General, and a serious attempt was once made to put this power in force against a General who had given offence to influential sections in the Order. Notwithstanding the apparent definiteness of these limitations, they virtually amount to nothing as checks, except in the hardly credible contingency of a General proving traitor to his power and seeking to undermine the basis of his own greatness. The real safeguard for the maintenance of the Order in the old lines resides in the extraordinarily careful probation every Jesuit has to undergo before promotion, which makes it well-nigh impossible for any false brother to escape detection at some point or other of his protracted inspection. In practice, and this is quite conformable to the intentions of the Founder, the General of the Jesuits is an autocrat, provided only he will exercise his vast prerogative in astute furtherance of the special aims of the Order, namely, the ascendancy of a particular ecclesiastical system and the extended subjugation of mind to certain habits of thought. It is true that, taken by themselves, the 'Regulations' we have mentioned need imply textually no more than studiously careful dispositions for ensuring stringent supervision and discipline in a body devoted to purely spiritual offices and sternly trained to rigorous observances. It is not, however, from the 'Regulations' that the practical working of the Order can be gathered. There exists a series of Privileges and Faculties and Declaratory Decrees which must be closely scanned if we would grasp the spirit of the Order as an active institution.

It is no exaggeration to affirm that, barring one or two quite minor items, not a single point is laid down in the 'Regulations' with the semblance of obligatory condition, the ready means for dispensing with which are not forthcoming in the Schedule of Faculties lodged in the General. The first circumstance that commands attention is the quite exceptional formula in which the engagements contracted by members of the Order are sworn. The Jesuit Father makes his solemn professions 'to the Almighty God in sight of the Virgin Mother . . . and to the

the General of the Society *standing in the place of God.*' The omission of any mention by name of Christ or the Trinity, coupled with the special invocation of the Virgin, are points eminently characteristic of the theology uniformly advocated by the Order; while the altogether unapproachable elevation ascribed to the General is emphatically typical of the spirit in which the Order is to be administered. That a Society avowedly intended for the special advocacy of particular Church interests should be rigorous as to the selection of its members, is only natural. In the 'Constitutions' it is solemnly declared that the Order shall be absolutely closed against whatsoever person has at any time been guilty of some delinquency, or labours under a serious imputation. But on perusing the less obvious portions of the 'Institutes,' we discover that the General alone decides as to what may or may not constitute a serious imputation. Nor is this all. If a candidate presents himself, who not merely labours notoriously under serious imputations, but actually stands convicted of delinquency, he is yet admissible if the General considers him possessed of natural advantages likely to prove of avail to the Society. There is no ambiguousness in the terms of the Faculty. The provisoes in the statutes as to conditions of exclusion are a mere flourish of the pen; for no disabilities can attach to any candidate—no matter what his antecedents—of whom the General believes that he is in possession of something whereby the 'Society would be greatly benefited.' It is well to grasp the import of this vast dispensing power, for in it is epitomized the essence of the Order as an organization. The system is wholly framed to the end of facilitating, at all moments and at every point, the employment of any force of practical fitness that may chance to offer itself, through the medium of a General invested with unlimited discretionary power. Accordingly it is within his competency to throw open the gates of the Order, or to keep them closed; to retain an individual for his whole life in mean drudgery, or to promote him to high trust; to expel him in a manner that brands with public ignominy, or again to ensure his noiseless egress.\* The head of no other religious community has ever been invested with

---

\* 'Nonnulli occulte dimitti possunt, quando causæ (quæ plurimæ et quidem ex illis aliquæ sine peccato esse possent) essent occultæ.'—Decl. A. In Cap. III. Const. Inst. vol. i. p. 368. A question suggests itself how such a faculty of occult dismissal could be applicable to any but those whose admission had been occult? It is difficult to understand how a recognised and professed member of the Order, who had been publicly wearing its dress, could be *occultly* sent out of it—that is, severed from community with the Order without such severance being made manifest, unless, for concealment's sake, he should be permitted still to assume before the world the guise of a Jesuit. The proviso would, however, be quite intelligible if applied to Crypto-Jesuits.

powers approaching those of the General of the Jesuits for the enlistment of every desirable recruit and the easy dismissal of any one not to his taste. On the other hand, should it be the General's opinion that a member seeking to quit the Order might yet prove of value to it ultimately, he is empowered, not merely to compel his remaining in it, but he is provided with faculties for humouring his disposition by indulgences that would allow of his having liberty for a period, but without being relieved from his obligation of obedience to the General.\* 'In proportion as the Society should be beholden to one as having deserved well of him, or as he might be endowed with special gifts of God for helping it in promoting God's governance, so should he be let go with greater difficulty; as on the contrary he to whom the Society may be less beholden, and who may be less fit for helping it in God's governance, can be let go more easily.† These are maxims laid down in the declaratory gloss attached to the chapter of the 'Constitutions' which treats of the rules that should guide the General in regard to his flock.

At a very early period it did not escape the observation of men who had the best means of judging, that the preference given in the Order to special aptitudes rather than to mere godliness was likely to undermine the purity of its religious profession. Thus St. Francis Borgia already, in an Encyclical written as General, expressed his fear lest the time might come, when, through undue consideration for what was opportune and apt, the Society might prove a field wherein ambition and pride would run riot without check, and he wound up with the remarkable words, 'Would to God that, before now, experience had not more than once taught us this.' A rebuke so sharp from one in St. Francis's high position was galling to the Fathers, and they accordingly had recourse to the simple process of altering the objectionable passage. The fact deserves attention as being the first important falsification that can be established against the Order. In the edition of the Epistles of the Generals of 1611, the original text of St. Francis is to be found; but in the three subsequent editions a version is given that thoroughly modifies the tenor of his remarks. There is yet another very venerable testimony on this head. St. Charles Borromeo gave expression in a letter to the following observations: 'The distinction drawn between those admitted to Profession and those not admitted to it is one likely to bring about some

\* 'Si hujusmodi essent [qui demissionem petunt] ut Deo gratum fore videretur, eos non sic relinquere . . . privilegiis ad negotium hujusmodi concessis a Sede Apostolica, quantum Superiori in Domino videbitur, uti licebit.'—Inst. i. p. 369.

† See Inst. vol. I. p. 365; Decl. C, I. Const. sec. pars.



day a misunderstanding which will have consequences. What most makes me think this is the seeing how the Superiors often do not admit the best subjects, while admitting with open arms those who are apt for sciences, though often they may be destitute of piety or devotion.' It would be a curious chapter which should give the catalogue of those who under various pleas have been rejected by the Order: not a few names eminent for Catholic doctrine would figure in it. It is enough to mention some who in this generation have knocked\* at the threshold of the Order, but either were informed that it would be better for them to apply elsewhere, or after having been taken on trial received an unmistakeable hint that their services could not be turned to account. Amongst the aspirants thus weighed in the balance and declared to be found wanting may be numbered the celebrated preacher Ventura, the Oratorian Theiner, who subsequently became Keeper of the Vatican Archives, Father Passaglia, and last, but certainly not least, John Henry Newman.

By the original constitution of the Order, it was enjoined that solemn professions could be made only in Rome, the obligatory residence of the General, the object being evidently to ensure that admission into the inner circle of the Society should never happen without the direct control of him who is its soul. Paul III., as early as 1549, had relaxed this prescription, and sanctioned the General's delegating to individuals of his own selection the faculty of admitting candidates into the Order—a provision that would not appear anomalous if limited to deputies taken from its ranks. It is, however, a startling fact that, on reading through the Privileges declared to be vested in the General by the Declaratory Glosses appended to the Constitution, we find him empowered to confide the most delicate trust in the Order to persons who are themselves not declared members of it. A proviso so extraordinary irresistibly calls to mind rumours about Crypto-Jesuits. We shall presently revert to the latter topic; here we merely desire to establish the existence of this anomalous Faculty, the text whereof we subjoin in a note.\* No less amazing are the unique immunities conferred on the Order by Pontifical charters. The Jesuit Father is expressly relieved from such ritual observances as are obligatory on all other Religious, while he is merely bound to observe decorum, local custom, and the simplicity congruous to a mental

---

\* 'Quibusdam tamen Præpositis Localibus vel Rectoribus et aliis Visitatoribus aut Personis Insignibus poterit Præpositus Generalis hanc auctoritatem communicare, imò et alicui qui de Societate non esset aliquo in casu.'—Decl. B, Cap. i. Const., Inst. vol. i. p. 407.

profession of poverty. The measure of the latter receives a striking illustration from the Faculty to carry on trade operations, which was conferred by Gregory XIII. in terms so ample as to be without parallel; and the public scandal attendant on Father Lavalette's commercial insolvency in the last century is evidence that the Society did not refrain from freely dealing in such operations. Still more interesting are the privileges whereby the Society is virtually put in possession of sovereign authority for its own administration, without preliminary deference to Papal sanctions. In 1543 Paul III., by a Brief, conferred on the Order the Faculty to modify its rules and statutes of its own accord, as *time and place might render expedient*, even to the extent of making quite new ones; such modifications and new enactments being declared *ipso facto* valid and through this charter surrounded at once with all the sacredness of express Apostolic confirmation.\* Pius V., in his enthusiasm for the excellence of these new soldiers of the Faith, was not satisfied with this. In his exuberant zeal he went the incredible length of issuing a Bull confirming to the Society all previously granted privileges, extending to it every privilege that ever had been or at any future time might be conferred on any Order with obligations of poverty, and furthermore declaratory that 'these present letters at no time whatever shall be capable of being revoked, limited, or derogated from by Ourselves or the aforesaid Holy See, nor shall they be comprehended within any revocation of similar or dissimilar graces . . . but for ever shall stand excepted therefrom.'† In virtue of this unique charter the Society is virtually constituted as a body which it is beyond the pale of Papal authority to control, inasmuch as that authority by this deed solemnly renounces in perpetuity all power to abrogate any one of the Privileges already appertaining to the Society, or secured to it in the future by this anticipatory document. In the eyes of Pius V., the strengthening of the Order was the strengthening of the forces at the service of the Holy See; but it is well to consider that such unique privileges also tend of necessity to establish titles which can be fairly invoked as a warrant for considering invalid any sentence, however solemn, of the Holy See, which might be unfavourable to the action or existence of the Society. Even this does not make up the sum of the possible immunities and liberties vested in the Order. We have hitherto dealt only with the category of privileges which are distinctly ascertainable, because declared and promulgated. But there is another category, of which all that is

\* See Inst. S. J., vol. i. p. 10, for this Brief. As the first General Congregation laid down, '*Regulas condere solus potest Generalis*,' the powers used in virtue of this Brief were practically vested in the General.

† See Inst. S. J., vol. i. p. 43.

declared is the fact of their existence—the category comprised under the vague term of *Oracula vivæ vocis*—privileges conferred by a Pope through word of mouth, without deed or document to leave a public trace that can establish their validity, which must accordingly rest on knowledge testified to by the original depositaries of Pontifical confidence, and handed down by tradition; or, if inscribed anywhere, then it must be in some secret records reserved for the eyes of only the innermost adepts of the Society. Let it not be supposed that the existence of such *Oracula* is open to the shadow of a doubt. It rests on absolutely unimpeachable authority—the declaration of the Society in its own Statute-Book. In the printed Compendium of its Privileges, the Order solemnly affirms ‘non minoris sunt efficaciam et valoris *vivæ vocis oracula* quam si per Bullam aut Breve ad perpetuam rei memoriam essent concessa.’\* There is no gainsaying the explicitness of these words, though the advocates of the Order seek to explain away their significance, and to reduce the range of what could possibly come within the scope of such inscrutable instruments. These pleas are, however, strikingly invalidated by the inadvertent testimony of the Society itself. In 1703 there was printed at Prague, in the presses of the Jesuit College, a Compendium † of the Privileges alone of the Society—a compilation authenticated with every possible voucher for its official character. In this volume occurs the remarkable declaration, that the obligations binding on conscience attach not merely to the Faculties ‘contained within this Compendium, but likewise to those which are secret or not promulgated—*occultis seu non manifestis*.’ It is acknowledged that the title whereby the Society of Jesus, in derogation from the Decrees of the Council of Trent, retains special privileges, rests on a clandestine warrant of this character given by Pius V. We shall point later to the allegation of a like warrant in respect to another matter of grave consequence. The two cases together indicate conclusively that the *Oracula vivæ vocis* should not be dismissed as a mere figure of speech which can never be credited with important bearings.

No point connected with the Society of Jesus has given rise to angrier controversy than the supposed existence of a grade of clandestine members, affiliated through bonds, not of mere sympathy, but of positive Profession and direct engagement, while exempted, in deference to motives of particular expediency, from any overt signs of Membership. The Crypto-Jesuit, stealing about the world under disguise, figures as the typical representa-

---

\* See Inst. S. J. vol. i. p. 323.

† ‘Compendium Priv. S. J. Pragæ, 1703. Typis Universitatis in Collegio Soc. Jesu.’ The passage in question will be found at p. 58.

052277 (1.2)  
Vol. 137

tive of the Order with one class of writers, while his existence has been pronounced the invention of a heated fancy by critics so little prone to priestly propensities as Bayle. Dr. Huber is disappointing in his treatment of the subject, for, while he leaves the impression of his belief in a provision for secret affiliation, he has not substantiated the allegation by any conclusive evidence. It must be admitted that there would be nothing in the fact of a clandestine grade necessarily incompatible *a priori* with the spirit of the institution. If the General is avowedly empowered to admit any candidate, though 'notoriously infamous for enormous crimes,' whose acquisition should promise to be of particular value to the Order, there cannot be anything incongruous in his being enabled to secure the accession of some equally valuable recruit through a secret engagement, in the event of particular circumstances barring such an one's ability to render full service to the interests of the Order if he were to appear publicly as a member—the more so as it is the distinctive condition of the Society to be exempt from any obligations of dress and from all the ritual observances compulsory on such as belong to the emphatically sacerdotal congregations. The Jesuits have, indeed, on all occasions stoutly denied the existence of a clandestine grade of Membership; but we are not acquainted with any writer of the Order who has effectually grappled with the particular texts and incidents which can be pointed to as giving colour to the allegation that to affiliate by secret profession, and to allow those thus affiliated to live on in the guise of seculars, is neither contrary to the letter of the rules, nor has been absolutely foreign to the practice, of the Order. In a Declaratory Gloss appended to the 'Constitutions,' as a definition of what lies within the area of the Society, it is affirmed to comprise not merely Professed Fathers and Novices, but all who at any time may be under some probation with an inward intention of 'ultimately living or dying in the Society,' and of being admitted some day to one or other of its grades. Over all these the General's authority is declared to extend implicitly;\* so that he would seem hereby empowered to assert a right of absolute command over individuals whose connection with the Order was merely that of an inward intention 'ultimately to live or die in it.' No doubt there is something cloudy about the wording of this passage, and if it stood alone we should certainly not consider it a sufficient warrant for the affirmation of an absolutely anomalous provision. But there is another capital passage in the Statutes

\* See Decl. A, in Cap. i. Const. v., Inst. i. p. 402. By the first General Congregation these Glosses, the power of making which was exclusively vested in the General, were declared to be of absolute and unimpeachable authority.

of the Order, to which we have already alluded in passing, that is so clear in its wording as to be free from all ambiguity. In this passage it is laid down that the admission of candidates\* can be effected only by the General in person, or through those on whom he has conferred special powers; and then follows the designation of the persons who may be so deputed. Amongst the persons designated are enumerated 'individuals of distinction,' without limitation as to their being of the Society, or even in holy orders, and then come these most remarkable words: '*Yea, even in some instances one who himself may not be of the Society.*' How words so clear and distinct could ever be made to bear plausibly any but their plain construction, baffles our conception. Until some commentator of superior skill shall have performed this wonderful feat, we shall venture to consider them conclusive on the point that by the statutes of the Society it is expressly declared not unlawful in particular exigencies to employ the agency of individuals who themselves have made no overt profession of the Order. And that the Faculty thus legitimized has not been allowed to remain wholly in abeyance,—for this there is also forthcoming evidence of a nature which it appears to us cannot be impugned.

The share due to Francis Borgia in the early fortunes of the Order is matter of notoriety, as also how he was a Spanish Grandee of illustrious lineage, holding high appointments in the State. For a man of his position to cast aside the glitter of the world's distinctions for a religious profession, at the call of an enthusiast, was necessarily a step beset by obstacles of no slight gravity. But Borgia's soul was bent on the furtherance of the work preached by Loyola, and finding himself perforce tied for a while to the world through various obligations, Borgia craved to be allowed, during the interval before he could conveniently loosen himself from those ties, to make a secret profession of the vows that are compulsory on a member of the Order. The indulgence so demanded was accorded. In February, 1548, Borgia, in the private chapel of his feudal mansion, made secret profession of the vows, after which to the outer world he still continued to be Duke of Gandia and Viceroy of Catalonia until circumstances were sufficiently matured to let him withdraw into the retirement of a religious house. Our knowledge of this case is drawn from no doubtful source. The occurrence is vouched for by Ribadeneira and Orlandini, two official writers of the Order. The only point in the transaction which can be open to question is how far the Profession made was more than mental—how far the

---

\* See Decl. B, in Cap. i. Const. v., Irst. i. p. 402.

Viceroy, on the occasion of the solemnity in his private chapel, bound himself in those absolute obligations which are exacted for actual Membership. In the absence of positive information as to the tenour of the vows sworn on that occasion, a very striking light is shed on the matter through a Pontifical deed, which, when the date is well considered, it is hardly possible not to refer directly to this incident. At the period of which we now treat, Paul III. had already solemnly approved the 'Constitutions' of the Order, and in special Bulls he had given his Pontifical sanction to the vast powers vested by the original scheme in the General. Everything needful for the confirmation of the General's unprecedented authority might, consequently, have seemed to have been secured. Nevertheless, in 1549—that is, immediately after Borgia's profession—Paul III. saw fit to issue another Bull, known as *Licet debitum*. In this remarkable document the Pope first reaffirmed the General's general jurisdiction over 'all members of the Society,' and then extended it likewise over such 'persons as might be living under obligations of obedience to him, wherever they may be residing, even though *exempt* and *notwithstanding whatever faculties they may be holding*.\* It suggests itself with irresistible force that so extraordinary an increase of the powers deliberately conferred but a short time before must have been due to some particular circumstance having since arisen; and does it not press itself upon us, with almost the weight of demonstration, that this circumstance must have been the peculiar case so exactly covered by the new provision—the case of Borgia's clandestine admission into the Order? At all events, the fact is manifest of a most suggestive synchronism between the admission of Borgia under anomalous conditions and the immediately subsequent promulgation of a Bull which exactly legalises whatever might have been open to challenge in that admission. Moreover, evidence of no trivial nature can be adduced that the case of Borgia does not stand by itself as an instance of clandestine affiliation.

In 1681 there was printed in Rome a collection of Letters by Oliva, General of the Order,† which is presented with even more than the usual vouchers of authenticity. Besides bearing the customary *imprimatur* of spiritual censorship, the edition must have been prepared by Oliva himself, who died only some weeks before its publication; while, in a prefatory statement, it

\* The Bull is couched in terms singularly explicit as to the distinction between the two classes. 'Plenam in universos ejusdem Societatis socios et personas sub ejus obedientia degentes, ubilibet commorantes, etiam exemptos, etiam quascumque facultates habentes, suam (jurisdictionem) exerceat.'

† 'Lettere di G. P. Oliva, 2 vol., Roma, presso al Varese, M.DC.LXXXI. Con licenza dei Superiori. Imprimatur: Rev. Pater Mag., S. Pet. Ap.'

is declared that every letter ascribed to Oliva and not contained in this collection is to be considered 'spurious, apocryphal, and injurious to his name.' In the collection of the General's letters thus amply authenticated there occurs more than one passage which might be taken to corroborate a practice of occult affiliation; but we shall confine ourselves to one, the explicitness of which seems to defy the possibility of any but a literal construction being put on the words. The 723rd Letter in the second volume is addressed to a Venetian nobleman, who sought to be publicly admitted as a Professed Member of the Society. Oliva saw reason why it would not be desirable to accede to the request, and in this letter he set himself to dissuade the nobleman from any public profession, on the ground that this step must materially impair his peculiar usefulness in behalf of the very interests which both had at heart. 'Most readily,' writes Oliva, 'would I receive you amongst the servants of God with the veneration due to your fervour, if after protracted examination of the circumstances I did not clearly perceive that the Eternal Father meant you for a Minister of his Sublime Republic rather than for a nursling of so holy a community.' After further remarks in this strain, Oliva continues: 'Nevertheless, in course of time I will show your Lordship *how to combine with the sacrament of wedlock the palms and crowns of religious profession* (la religione). *It was in this manner that under my direction a Cardinal dedicated himself to God while retaining the purple to serve the Church, and crucified himself to the Society* (la Compagnia), *so as not to forego the acquisition of holiness by a clandestine* (occulta) *and sworn submission to whoever shall be and is the successor of the Holy Father.* To you the opportunity will not fail for promoting the interests of Divine service in the magisterial offices which high lineage ensures, and thus it will be yours to be more thoroughly one of us while retaining your independent station and being on the watch in our defence.' It will not escape observation that the expressions employed by Oliva in regard to the engagement contracted 'under his direction' by the Cardinal are those which are applicable, with the closest precision, to the specific vows demanded on full Profession. The Society is designated by its technical term of Company, and the obligation, by which the Cardinal binds himself in secret, is that obligation of implicit obedience to the Pope, which the Professed Jesuit of four vows has to contract. There seems no loophole here for disputing the character of the engagement entered into, as there is none for denying its secrecy or questioning the ground on which the proceeding was recommended. It is conceivable to set up a plausible plea against  
the

the literal construction of the flowery phrase about combining 'palms and crowns of religious profession with the sacrament of wedlock;' but none can be advanced against the plain and matter-of-fact language in which the counsel is given not to follow out the strong inward call for a public Profession of religious vocation, on the one ground that by doing so a considerable worldly advantage must be sacrificed, to the consequent loss of desirable political influence.

The marked nebulousness which surrounds the conditions attaching to the class of the Professed Fathers of three vows has induced the surmise that the affiliated members (assuming their existence) are to be found in this division. Such was the opinion expressed by Monclar in his masterly pleading before the Aix Parliament—one of the most critical disquisitions on the 'Constitutions' of the Order. 'The creation of those Professed of three vows is one of the mysteries of the policy of the Society,' are his words. 'Wherefore add this intermediary class? No one has been able to understand the true ground. . . . The first mention of it occurs in Julius III.'s Bull of 1550. . . . Suarez informs us of the remarkable circumstance that they can be exempted from taking the priesthood, though simple Coadjutors, and even Scholars after a specified age, are bound to become priests. Through this dispensation it is possible for mere clerks and even laymen to hold positions superior to those of priests in the Society.' Whoever has studied the intricate regulations of the Order will admit that Monclar is perfectly justified in asserting that there is nothing to bar recourse to such occult stratagems, though it must be of the essence of such devices to render conviction very difficult. That on various occasions the Jesuits have not shrunk from courses of procedure more marked by the spirit of slyness than of fearlessness is notorious. No fair-minded person will make it the ground of charge that, in the days of our Penal Laws, Jesuit Fathers should have stolen into this country disguised as Protestants, with the view of secretly ministering to the religious wants of persecuted and destitute Catholics; but the question is different in reference to their operation in China and Sweden. We shall presently refer more fully to the former case: as to the latter we will merely state that, in 1574, some Members of the Order not merely introduced themselves into Sweden in the guise of Protestants, but that one of the number deemed it conformable to his conscience to occupy, as an useful medium for disseminating grains of Catholic divinity, a theological chair in the Protestant College. Before dismissing this much controverted and very obscure point of secret affiliation,



it should be observed that the inference, which Oliva's words seem to warrant, may find further confirmation in a decree of the first General Congregation, and in an elaborate disquisition by one of the greatest luminaries of the Order, Suarez. In this Congregation the question was raised, whether Lay Members of the Order of Christ—a semi-religious, semi-military body of chivalry—could be admitted into the Society,\* 'though there might be ground for believing that they had no intention to make profession amongst us,' and the resolution was affirmative. Now, there was nothing distinctive of this Order from any other semi-religious Order of chivalry, so that what was explicitly ruled to hold good in the case of the laymen enrolled in the Order of Christ must hold good likewise of those enrolled in kindred associations; and this Suarez unequivocally affirms in an argument singularly elaborate and explicit. This sublime doctor demonstrates at great length that the obligations consequent on religious vows can be deemed adequately fulfilled by any Member of such Orders, though living in wedlock, so that, according to this ruling, any individual doing service in behalf of the interests of this Society in some particular line might become affiliated to it while living with a wife, provided he had contracted those engagements of obedience, &c., demanded from every one who enters into any Order. It is no part of our purpose to conjecture whether those who have administered the Society have often put in practice the Faculties sanctioned by these authorities. The point of importance is to establish their existence, and to demonstrate how the shrewd minds that ruled the Society worked out and legalised a system of warrants, under which practices of stratagem and of hidden affiliation would be readily justified whenever they were found to be expedient.

The practice of covertly modifying, through subsequent glosses of an unobtrusive form, the conditions clearly enjoined in the body of the Statutes, deserves particular notice in reference to the obligations of poverty, and the prohibition against assumption of ecclesiastical dignities, which are both so stringently laid down

---

\* 'An sæculares qui emittunt vota in ordine militari vocato Christi possint ad Societatem nostram admitti, licet credatur non emissuros Professionem apud nos. Responsum est admitti foro.' Inst. vol. i. p. 480. The only ground which suggests itself why this particular Order should have been specially considered, is that it was a Portuguese Order, and that at this period the Jesuits were specially favoured at the Court of Portugal. Suarez, whose argument is to be found in the 'De Religione,' Tract. ix. lib. i. c. 10, is explicit in not confining his remarks to any one Order; and as to the status of such knights he concludes, 'has personas esse Ecclesiasticas . . . quia censentur habere in Ecclesiâ proprium et specialem statum Ecclesiasticum et non sæcularem, nec clericalem, ergo religiosum.' The terms of his thesis are singularly definite: 'An etiam ordines militares qui castitatem tantum conjugalem vovent, sint proprie religiosi?'

in the Rules. It is notorious to how great a degree the Order has departed from the condition of impecuniosity. The proposition soon suggested itself to intellects trained in dialectics that, though the individual member could never hold property, the words of the Founder did not forbid revenues, however large, being attached to the establishment in which these pauper members resided. In 1550, Julius III., by a Bull, expressly sanctioned the possession of property by the General for the general benefit of the community, and the permission thus granted has been used with a freedom that needs no illustration. In regard to the other point, however, the conduct of the Jesuits has been sufficiently cautious to credit them, in the eyes of some grave writers, with a meritorious refusal of rank, and particularly with the honourable distinction of not having connected themselves with the tribunal of the Inquisition. The truth is that, though as a practice the Jesuits have been content to hold the less ostentatious but most influential position of Confessors to Sovereigns and persons of high degree, they have never declined ecclesiastical preferment when its acceptance did not seem inexpedient. It is enough to recal the names of Lugo, Toletus, Bellarmine, and quite recently Tarquini, as of Jesuits who have been raised to the purple. So again in regard to the Inquisition, it is easy to give a list of Jesuits ranking high by their doctrine in the Order, as Castro-Palao, Tamburini, Marin, Pereyra, who were members of the Holy Office; while Father Nitard was for a time Grand Inquisitor in Spain. We have it besides, under the hand of Loyola himself, that the principles of this sanguinary tribunal are quite in conformity with those of his foundation. The circumstances attending this utterance are too curious not to be noticed. John III. of Portugal, the first royal devotee to Loyola's doctrine, being desirous to have a Confessor who was of the Order, applied first to Father Gonzalez and then to the Provincial Miron. Both were so simple-minded as to consider the proposal incompatible with the profession not to accept proffered distinction, and reported to Loyola their having declined the request. Loyola replied in a letter eminently characteristic, and decidedly not expressive of approval.\* St. Ignatius instructed Gonzalez that although preferments should never be courted, it was yet a duty to accede to a request of this nature, notwithstanding it entailed so heavy a cross as compulsory residence within the precincts of a Court—an opinion repeated in a letter to the Provincial, which he was directed to communicate to the King. John III.,

\* The correspondence relating to this transaction may be found in the German 'Life of Loyola,' by the Jesuit Genelli, printed at Innsbruck, 1848.

delighted at this sympathy on the part of the holy man with his longings, now proffered further privileges. It was his desire that the Tribunal, which in his dominion specially watched over the repression of heresy, should be confided to the hands of these trusty champions of the Faith. Again he applied to the Provincial Miron, and again Loyola showed himself most ready to meet the King's wishes. Some difficulties, however, stood in the way. The Holy Office had long been the special appurtenance of the old-established Brotherhoods, and their influence in Rome might not improbably prevent the substitution of a new and encroaching Order. In a letter stamped with consummate astuteness, Loyola expressed his readiness to assume the proposed duties, and suggested means for circumventing opposition. 'Such an office being by no means contrary to our Institution,' wrote Loyola, 'there can be no reason why the Society should decline undertaking a matter so directly concerning its service and the purity of religion in that realm. But it seems to us, for avoidance of much inconvenience, that it would be advisable if his Highness should be pleased to write to the Pope, so that the latter might direct us to assume this office; for then his Holiness could command the Society to take this concern in hand in that country, and thereby the business would be brought about with his co-operation. At the same time a letter to our protector, Cardinal Carpi, might be advantageous, as likewise one to the King's Envoy, so as to make him push on the matter.' And after further advice Loyola concludes with these characteristic suggestions: 'Should, however, his Highness be of opinion that the Pope's concurrence cannot be hoped for, then, to make a beginning, it might be possible for one or two of us to discharge the Office temporarily until it could be done officially with the Pope's sanction.' To attempt to construe out of these words an expression confirmatory of indisposition to participate in the practices essential to the principle of the Inquisition, is a task which we hold will perplex the most consummate master in casuistry.

It must be apparent to the reader who has followed us so far, that the Organisation of the Society of Jesus is a creation comprising an armoury of unique weapons, at the direct disposal of a General who is an Autocrat. For, so long as the General only puts in play his powers in furtherance of particular interests, technically designated those of God's Greater Glory, he is free to strain them to any extent without check or trammel on his discretion. It is only if he should ever become tempted to deviate from the line of these interests, that the General instantly finds his strength incapable of making any impression on the grim stubbornness

stubbornness of a system stiffened into cast-iron rigidity through carefully methodical saturation by an essence as subtle as it is indelible. The irresistible effect of so much concentrated power must naturally be to efface the action of every organic force except the General's, whose authority becomes irresistibly inflated by the assumption of despotic pretensions, hardly in character with the profession of humility. On both heads—the inordinate extension of the General's pretensions, and yet his incompetency to effect reform in the system—striking proof can be adduced. Under the administration of Acquaviva, the Spanish Jesuits resented strongly the General's arbitrary mode of government, and drew up a remonstrance to Clement VIII. In this remarkable document,\* the Pope was besought to stay the intolerable action of one who bore himself as if he were the Master of Masters, inspired by an infallible nature, able to do exactly as he liked—to dispense favours solely at his whim—to adjudge and command, to make and unmake, according to the uncontrolled dictates of his personal humour—these complaints being supported by elaborate allegations. National jealousy of Italian ascendancy—for till then the Generals had been Spaniards—may probably have whetted the resentment of the writers; but still, as seen by the light of subsequent events, the remonstrance can only be considered as the forcible expression of stern truth, and of a sentiment characteristic of the generation that really founded and reared the Order. It is permeated with that proud spirit of Oligarchy, which made Mariana exclaim that Monarchy because unlimited was preparing the downfall of the Society—the spirit of men who were ready to follow with unhesitating enthusiasm Loyola as a commander, but never contemplated a General who should become an irresponsible Caliph. Nothing came of the demonstration, for already the General had absorbed the life of the Order, and the Pope himself, had he been so minded, could not have curbed the Society, as was proved by Innocent XI.'s failure to enjoin on it the abandonment of Molinist views. Himself of Jansenist leanings and anxious to repress the spread of Probabilist doctrine, Innocent succeeded in bringing about the elevation to the Generalship of Gonzalez, whom he knew to be an austere Anti-Probabilist. Indeed he had written a treatise in this sense, which was still in manuscript at his election, but subsequently printed. Notwithstanding the vast prerogatives vested in his hands, Gonzalez failed absolutely in making any impression. The Order proved stubbornly mutinous, inces-

\* This most noteworthy paper, the genuineness of which is not disputed, is to be found in the '*Tuba Altera majorem clangens sonum de necessitate longæ maxime Reformandi Soc. Jesu*,' *Argentinae*, 1714, p. 556.

santly caballing against the General with malevolent denunciations, until he was worried to death, unto the signal overthrow of the united forces of a General and a Pope, who for once happened to strive together in the direction of a reform.

How futile it is for a Pope to think himself able, of his own authority, to make the Society acquiesce in commands, however solemn, when not to its taste, despite the oath of special obedience to him which every Professed Jesuit Father swears as his distinctive obligation—of this signal evidence was afforded in that curious Episode known as the controversy about the Chinese Rites. We cannot discuss how far the Jesuits stand convicted of having paganized Christian doctrine—of having falsified essential articles of faith so as to suit the temper of a heathen people. The fact is plain, that early in the seventeenth century the highest authority in the Church saw reason for entertaining the gravest misgivings as to the mode in which, through the instrumentality of the Jesuits, conversions had been wrought in China and Japan on a scale so vast as to have shed dazzling lustre on the assumedly superior efficacy of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Notwithstanding the constitutional indisposition of Rome to move against those who are promoting her ascendancy, it was felt incumbent to dispatch persons with powers for inquiring into and correcting the reported questionable practices of the Jesuit missionaries. The ecclesiastics sent, selected mostly from the Dominican and Franciscan Orders, comprised three Bishops and Vicars-Apostolic. On their arrival in those distant regions, they encountered from the Jesuits a reception as spiteful to themselves as it was glaringly disrespectful to the Holy See. There exists a memorial addressed to Innocent XI. by Cerri, secretary to the Propaganda, which narrates in detail the outrageous proceedings of the Jesuits. Not only did they deride the authority of these direct emissaries from Rome, but they carried audacity to the length of declaring the Apostolical credentials to be forgeries, and of persuading the natives that these new-comers were pseudo-Christians—impostors whose ministrations were but profane parodies on the holy mysteries, and they even exerted their ascendancy at the Court of Peking to get these venerable ecclesiastics seized and forcibly transported into the dungeons of the Inquisition at the Portuguese settlement of Goa. In vain did Clement X. and several subsequent Popes launch censures against such signal insubordination. Conscious of their local influence, the Jesuit Fathers in China laughed at these Pontifical bolts. They even advanced the noteworthy allegation that, as they acted under specific authority from their General, Bulls and Briefs in a contrary sense from the Pope could not affect them.

After

After years of protracted scandal and grossly flagrant repudiation of Pontifical censures, Clement XI. at last dispatched Cardinal Tournon, with the solemn character of Legate, with authority to put a forcible stop to this outrageous condition of things by the exercise of the severest powers of the Church. Despite his august rank, Tournon found himself every whit as unable as his predecessors to get the Pope's orders acquiesced in. Not merely was he expelled from Peking, but attempts were made on his life at the instigation of the Jesuits; and ultimately they caused him to be thrown by their friends the Portuguese into cruel confinement at Macao, where he died miserably. The circumstances attending this extraordinary procedure are narrated in a scarce book edited by the celebrated Cardinal Passionei, who supports his allegations by extracts from the reports of Tournon and his secretary Angelilla. The questioned genuineness of these documents has been thoroughly established, though the traces of this authoritative confirmation have been so carefully effaced as to be virtually inaccessible. The *Pères de la Mission*, commonly called Lazarists, whose head-quarters are in Paris, some years ago prepared for publication, and actually printed, a collection of missionary reports. One volume referred to the China Missions, and for it Father Theiner, then Keeper of the Vatican Archives, collated the texts given by Passionei with the original documents in the Archives, and testified to their absolute identity. But suddenly a stringent order from Rome prohibited the issue of the volumes, which were already printed, and that suppression has been so rigidly enforced that they may be said not to exist. It has not been possible to procure a copy for the British Museum. Dr. Huber, indeed, makes a reference to the book, as if it were a publication within everybody's reach. We believe a stray volume of the collection—the very one Dr. Huber refers to—does exist at Munich in the library of an ecclesiastical dignitary of European reputation, where Dr. Huber probably saw it. We have it at least on the authority of one whose knowledge of ecclesiastical libraries is probably superior to that of any living person, that he is aware of but one complete copy, which is in the library of a religious community, and not accessible to a student who might inquire for it. This fact is worthy of attention, as indicative of the extraordinary care taken by the Jesuits to ensure at any cost the obliteration of all evidence that can be unfavourable to the proceedings of the Society, no matter on what occasion or at how remote a period.\*

---

\* The collection is in eight volumes, and was printed in or about 1865, under the title of '*Mémoires de la Congrégation de la Mission*.'

The curious plea in behalf of their contumacious disregard of Pontifical censures, which the Jesuits based on the superior authority of an instruction from the General, cannot fail to remind the reader of that remarkable Brief by which Pius V. secured the privileges of the Order from revocation even by a Pope, and of the acknowledged conveyance of Faculties through the inscrutable medium of *Oracula vivæ vocis*. In regard to both these points, the action taken by the Order on its suppression by Clement XIV. is curiously significant. No Pontifical utterance could possibly be more emphatically solemn than the Bull *Dominus ac Redemptor*. The Society itself seemingly deferred to the sentence, and its members made a show of dispersing into obscurity. But very soon they were found to congregate again in the dominions of the heretical Sovereigns of Prussia and Russia, whence they began to promulgate views flagrantly derogatory to the Holy See, and in contradiction to those they themselves had previously upheld. \* In Cologne Father Feller, a Jesuit divine of repute, printed so direct an attack on the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope, that a public apology was exacted, while in the University of Heidelberg another Jesuit publicly affirmed the proposition that the Pope could claim no power, direct or indirect, over Bishops, as they derived authority straight from Christ. In Silesia the Provincial, notwithstanding the Pope's Bull, kept his establishment open for the reception of dispersed brethren. In Russia, at the instigation of the Jesuits, the Empress Catherine threatened reprisals on all Catholic foundations, if any attempt were made by the Nuncio to enforce the decree of suppression on the members of the Society in her dominions; and, after opening a new house of Novitiate, the Fathers met, in 1782, to nominate a Vicar-General for the administration of the Order, which had been suppressed officially by the Holy See. They had even recourse to the dissemination of spurious documents with the view of making the masses believe that the allegation was unfounded of the Order being under the cloud of an abiding censure. Two forged Briefs were circulated, bearing respectively the dates of June 9 and June 29, 1774, the former expressive of the Pope's joy at the position of the Order in Russia, and the second announcing the immediate repeal of his predecessor's Bull. 'There is no conceivable error against true doctrine which there is not ground for apprehending that we may see professed by persons who are exasperated, licentious, irreligious, and the worshippers of might,' are the words written by the Nuncio Garampi in a secret dispatch,\*

---

\* To be found in Theiner's '*Hist. of Clement XIV.*,' vol. ii. p. 409.

under date of November, 1773. Nor was it merely in the heat of an excited struggle for existence that the Jesuits allowed themselves to be hurried into having recourse to a reprehensible stratagem. The story of these absolutely spurious documents has been gravely reaffirmed by recent Jesuit writers of high standing, whose intellectual capacities carry within them melancholy guarantees that this cannot have been due to want of discernment. No less eminent a man than Father Curci—the starring preacher at the Gesù Church in Rome, and amongst the most prominent contributors to that ‘*Civiltà Cattolica*,’ on which Pius IX. has conferred the unprecedented distinction of being declared in an Apostolical Brief the specific organ of veracity and holy doctrine—has not refrained from repeating the glaringly false statement of the insertion of the said Brief in the ‘*Warsaw Gazette*’ with the acquiescence of the resident Nuncio;\* nor is Father Curci the only modern Jesuit who has seen fit to speak of these fabrications as if they had been genuine documents. But Dr. Huber advances a curious statement, calculated to impart a new character to these otherwise inconceivably insubordinate proceedings of the Order, which we give on his responsibility, as the authority quoted by him is not within our reach. According to it the Society, though not revived publicly until 1814, had been so clandestinely many years before, through an *Oraculum vivæ vocis* given by Pius VI. This allegation rests on a statement made, according to Dr. Huber, by Father Roothan, the late General of the Order, in a printed Encyclical, under the date of December 27, 1839, which statement, Dr. Huber affirms, was never called in question by the Holy See. The allegation, if correct—and we have no reason for impugning so circumstantial a statement on the part of Dr. Huber—is most remarkable and signally significant; for even if we were to assume the utterance of this particular *Oraculum* to have been an invention of Father Roothan’s, the fact is still established—by his reference in a solemn act to the supposed creation of an organic faculty through the medium of this most inscrutable instrument—that the instrument itself, so far from being considered obsolete, and an unmeaning appendage, is recognised as a living and capital factor in the present organism of the Society.

The death of Clement XIV. has been ascribed to poison administered by the Jesuits. That such an idea should recommend itself to a certain class of writers is natural, but it is matter of astonishment to find Dr. Huber giving countenance to a story

---

\* See his ‘*Una Divinazione sulle tre ultime opere di V. Gioberti*.’ Paris, 1848.



so manifestly unsupported by any but the flimsiest evidence. No one who gathers his knowledge of the circumstances surrounding Clement's death from Dr. Huber's narrative can well acquire any other impression than that, notwithstanding Dr. Salicetti's medical statement after a post-mortem examination, the indications of a mysterious cause of death are still serious, and that the fact of the Pope having been poisoned was believed in at the time by some who were in a position to have the best means of knowing what happened inside the Vatican. We wish we could remain under the impression that Dr. Huber has here been merely guilty of carelessness; but there is an arrangement in his apparent references and in his statements which savours strongly of studied intention. According to Dr. Huber, the Spanish Ambassador, Monino, reported his firm persuasion that the Pope had been poisoned; this belief was credited at the Court of Spain and generally in the Cabinets of Europe; and 'it is a fact' that antidotes were found after the Pope's death in his room. It is noteworthy that Dr. Huber omits all but a passing reference to Father Theiner's '*Life of Clement XIV.*,' not only the capital work on the subject, but one written in a spirit decidedly hostile to the Jesuits. The reason may possibly be found in the circumstance that Father Theiner, despite his unfriendliness towards the Society, is clear in wholly exonerating the Jesuits from having poisoned the Pope. But Dr. Huber does refer, in support of his allegation, to another historian of standing, Ginzel, and therefore it may fairly be demanded of him to have carefully read and faithfully given the statements of his cited authority. We have seen Dr. Huber affirms 'as a fact' the discovery of medicines in the Pope's apartments that were antidotes. On turning to Ginzel,\* we find the following words: 'Of these pills the Pope made use, at the advice of Dr. Bianchi, as a means to promote perspiration, and by no means as an antidote.'† Is this a statement confirmatory of Dr. Huber's glib allegation? Far more important, however, than the opinion of any modern writer, would be the proof that at the time Foreign Ambassadors, such as the Spanish and Neapolitan, with their excellent means of information, had been led to the conclusion that poison had been administered, and on this head direct evidence is afforded in a book Dr. Huber never seems to have heard of, Ferrer del Rio's '*History of Charles III.*' What a leading position was occupied by the Neapolitan Minister Tanucci amongst the political influences brought to bear against the Society of Jesus, is

\* Ginzel, '*Kirchenhistorische Schriften*,' vol. ii. p. 246.

† This Dr. Bianchi was a personal friend of the Pope's from his youth, and a native of Rimini.

notorious. He, at all events, can never be reckoned as a witness whose testimony in favour of the Order must be considered liable to the imputation of partiality. Yet on two occasions Tanucci expressed his clear conviction, in confidential letters, that there was no shadow of foundation for the charge of poison, and in one addressed to King Charles,\* he even referred to the very Monino whose authority is invoked by Dr. Huber in support of the statement which he has not scrupled to introduce into his text. There cannot be a doubt that the charge against the Jesuits of having accelerated the death of Clement XIV. by poison is substantiated by no tittle of valid evidence, and it is lamentable to find in a book like Dr. Huber's allegations, though in part veiled and rather insinuated than directly expressed, which are wholly unworthy of an author who lays claims to critical faculties.

Unfortunately this is not the only instance where Dr. Huber has been led into making very grave statements which can be characterized only as being without the shadow of foundation. A notable example occurs in his account of what passed on the occasion of the discussions in presence of Clement VIII. in reference to the doctrines about grace, represented by Molina. Dr. Huber's narrative is as follows: 'In the History of these Transactions, where both parties carried on their causes, it is related how the Jesuits made expressly for the occasion an edition of Augustine, in which they altered or expunged all the passages contrary to their doctrine. Thus, in 1603, Valentia, in presence of Clement VIII., affirmed, in the teeth of the Dominican Lemos, who had cited a passage of Augustine, that the same did not exist in his writings. Thereupon Lemos demanded that the works of this Father should be fetched. But Valentia had them quite ready to hand and read, out of the falsified edition prepared by the Order, the very contrary to what the Dominican had affirmed. Taken wholly aback at this, Lemos asked that the works of Augustine be fetched out of the Pope's library, and Clement VIII. was then able to convince himself with his own eyes that the Dominican had quoted correctly. On the fraud being thus

---

\* 'Hist. de Carlos III.,' por Don A. Ferrer del Rio. Madrid, 1856. Vol. ii. p. 505. Tanucci escribió á Centomani el 8 de Octubre: 'La recibida confidencial con que V. S. I. me ha favorecido el 4 del corriente concluye lo que yo creia del decantado veneno; esto es, que no es veneno criminal, sino veneno dialéctico el origen del deplorable suceso.' A Carlos III. el 11 de Octubre: 'Monino habrá referido la conjetura y la fama del veneno por obra de los jesuitas. Seria sumamente prolijo el discurso con el cual, despues de haber considerado y leído muchas cartas y minutas voluminosas de Roma sobre el asunto, ha venido á la opinion de que ningun otro veneno han dado los jesuitas y tantos agentes suyos en aquella corte al buen Papa sino el de hacerla creer que estaba envenenado.'

disclosed,

disclosed, the Pope said to Valentia, "Is it in this manner that you seek to deceive the Church of God?" Whereupon the latter fainted, and two days later died.\* For all this Dr. Huber refers, as his one authority, to Serry's '*Historia Congreg. de Auxiliis*.' Now, in the first place, it may be asked why refer to a second-hand authority? Serry was merely a compiler, who very fairly, in his account of this capital discussion, refers to and quotes quite accurately the narrative by Lemos, himself an active participator in the debate, and one of the principal parties in the supposed transactions narrated by Dr. Huber. It will seem hardly credible that neither in Serry nor in Lemos is there one word which justifies the astounding statement, that the Jesuits had expressly printed a falsified edition of Augustine, and brought it forward during the discussion in support of the views which they sought to affirm. It is narrated with dramatic effect that Valentia, in the course of his spoken argument, did cite a passage out of the '*De Civitate Dei*'—that Lemos, taken at first aback, nevertheless happily remembered the passage; and, recognising the quotation to be garbled, appealed to the Pope to have it looked up—and that thus he convicted the Jesuit doctor of misquotation.† What, therefore, stands on record is the fact of a garbled reference—one, doubtless, of capital importance for the matter under discussion, but still garbled only in spoken reference, and not at all such a most elaborate and portentous trick as would have been the deliberately falsified edition which Dr. Huber explicitly alleges to have been printed by the Jesuits, with the express view of misrepresenting St. Augustine, and making him appear to have held views in conformity with their favourite theology. Dr. Huber's reputation is too high to let it be thought possible that he should have knowingly given currency to a sheer invention—an absolute myth. We do, however, believe him culpable of negligence and hastiness. As he was content with a passing reference to Serry, instead of looking into Lemos, so we can understand that he satisfied himself with a mere glance at his authority, without reading through the very detailed account which is given of the incidents attending this remarkable controversial duel. We regret sincerely to have had to notice blemishes of this nature in a book which has so much to recommend it, which treats a vast amount of matter in the main correctly and vigorously, and which certainly constitutes a valuable contribution to our literature on the Society of Jesus.

Here, for the present, we break off. Complicated and intricate

\* See Huber, p. 282.

† The passage can be found in Lemos, '*Hist. Congreg. de Auxiliis*.' Lovaniæ, 1702. P. 279.

as are the matters we have been dealing with, they are yet surpassed in these respects by the various topics that would have to be necessarily treated in an outline of the doctrine which has been propounded by great and leading Jesuit Doctors. A review, however abridged, of the really essential points must yet demand an amount of detail requiring more space than remains at our disposal, so that we must defer till our next issue the consideration of this important portion of our subject.

---

ART. II.—1. *Travels in Little Known Parts of Asia Minor.* By the Rev. Henry J. Van Lennep, D.D., thirty years missionary in Turkey. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1870.

2. *Commercial and other Reports, received at the Foreign Office from Her Majesty's Consuls, &c., in Turkey, during the Years 1867-72.* London.

‘ALTHOUGH in the opinion of some it matters but little to England whether an Othman, a Romanof, or a Hapsburg rule on the banks of the Bosphorus, it does, in the opinion of all, concern her much whether a Turk or a Frank rule in the Valley of the Nile.’

Thus far the practical good sense of ‘Mushaver Pasha,’ Sir Adolphus Slade; and had the gallant Admiral added the Valley of the Euphrates to that of the Egyptian stream, and coupled the Red Sea with the Persian Gulf, his proposition would have gained in completeness without losing in force.

The problem, or, to use the stereotyped phrase where the East is concerned, the ‘question,’ thus implied is one the solution of which depends on two distinct factors, namely, the external relations and the internal condition of the Ottoman Empire. However sound within, a nation may—though that is a rare event—be crushed, and even disintegrated, by overwhelming pressure from without; but however little interfered with, even bolstered up, it may be from without, it cannot, in accordance with the laws of nature, long continue to hold its own if it is corrupt and decaying within. Neither alone nor with as many allied Powers as may be ready to hand, can England guarantee the continued existence of the ‘Sick Man,’ if his sickness be unto death; nor even if she could, ought she, in her own best interest, to do so. But it is easier to speculate on, perhaps to calculate, the actual or possible designs of Turkey’s neighbours and enemies, than to form as much as even an approximately correct appreciation of the degree of her vitality or exhaustion within herself; and it is perhaps for this reason that discussion more often turns  
on

on what surrounds the Ottoman territory than on the equally or even more important topic, what is the real condition of the Government and the populations included within that diminished, but still vast, area, the land of the Crescent.

Yet if there exist on the face of the earth an Empire into which such an investigation is not only justifiable, but even necessary, on our part, it is the Ottoman. There is, or at least there ought to be, no need for insisting on the geographical importance of its position by sea and by land—on the keys of the Red Sea, of the Black Sea, of the Persian Gulf, of India, of Central Asia—any more than on the gordian knot of complicated intrigue that ceaselessly twists and tangles within its limits, and that may any moment, must some moment, entangle in its coils the destinies of Western Europe, and our own the foremost. Setting all these things aside, there remain more special reasons, and of a nature to regard ourselves principally, though not exclusively.

Scarce twenty years have elapsed since the outbreak of the all too-famous Crimean war; not twenty since its conclusion by the Treaty of Paris. Nor do we intend any disparagement to our allies of that date when we assert, that among all the European signatories, assembled in Paris March 30, 1856, none accepted the 9th Article of the document then laid before them, with all its fair words of Imperial promise, more sincerely, more confidently, more hopefully, than the representatives of England. It was the acknowledgment of a debt contracted; a debt not the less real, because implied throughout rather than expressed; a convention too well understood to admit the formal obscurantism of diplomatic phrases. And how stood the contracting parties? On the one side there was support given, blood poured out, treasure lavished; on the other figured reiterated pledges, assurances of reform, of progress, of whatever may be summarily described as the good conduct of a nation: such were the title-deeds, and such the ratification. The one Empire, the Ottoman, admitted its short-comings in the past, and promised a new and better era in the future; the other, our own, accepted the promises, and gave the help which, in the days of Mentchikoff and Nicholas, was nothing less than a renewed lease of existence to the heirdom of Othman.

Liberal, indeed, was the help, and liberal, too, were the promises in return. Civil equality for all subjects of the Crescent, whatever their creed or race; abuses to be done away; monopolies to be thrown open; taxes moderated, and the proceeds usefully employed for the public benefit; justice even and unpurchased; education of all degrees and for all classes; public works; yearly budgets; encouragement of trade and industry,  
 nay,

may, even popular representation: whoever wants to study the programme has but to glance over the numerous Hatti-Hamai-youns, Tanzeemats, Tashkeelats, and analogous documents, Firmans, Iradets, Protocols, and so forth, that have radiated in an unceasing star-shower of bright Imperial promise from the palatial centre ever since 1856, and still radiate: if he would see the performance let him look at the Empire. •

Not, however, at Constantinople itself—whether it be within the walls of old Stamboul or on the heights of modernised Pera; nor yet among the villas of Chalcedon or the Bosphorus. The capital of a despotic, even of a centralised—the one adjective may pretty fairly stand as a synonym for the other—Government, is but a delusive standard by which to measure the country around it, except it be by antithesis, perhaps. Besides, Constantinople is not a capital only, it is a seaport; nor a seaport only, but a refuge, a very nest of adventurers, of quacks, of sham diplomatists, of swindlers, of the worst scum of Western pseudo-enterprise and rascality, collected to prey on Eastern ignorance and supineness; of Europeans degraded into the baseness of Asiatic vice, and Asiatics refined into the finish of European scoundrelism; a repair where the robbers of all races divide and batten on their ill-gotten gains, and where Blake's visionary verses on an imaginary London find, with slight change, a much truer application than in our own or any other European capital:

‘the hapless “peasant’s” sigh  
Runs in blood down palace walls.’

Here no just estimate can be made either of the social condition or of the progress of Turkey at large.

To the provinces, then, and above all to those least subject to foreign influence—least modified by stranger contact—where Turkish development, Turkish manners, Turkish institutions, have their freest play; to the land which was the birthplace and still is the strong tower of the Turkish Empire, the provinces of Asia Minor, the Anatolia of our day. Here, if anywhere, we can take a just measurement of Turkish progress or decline.

Two sources of information are open to us, though each has its drawback: the one that of being too drily matter of fact, the latter not enough so. The former comprises the Reports, Diplomatic, Consular, or Commercial, yearly laid before Parliament, and duly promulgated, enough for our purpose at least, in Blue-books large and small, folio, octavo, and the rest. Much may be learned from them; and it is a pity that the fashion of their compilation should render them to the reading public in general as sealed as ever was the book of the Apocalyptic Seer. Yet they

are worth study, not as models of style, but as repertoires of fact. The statistics of population, of commerce, of taxation, the condition of the agricultural, of the industrial classes, the tenure of land, the value of labour or rent, are mixed up in them with many curious notices on the administration of law and justice, on colonisation, on the relative position of Mahometans and Christians, on education, on police—in brief, on every topic. With a certain sameness in the outlines, they differ, however, considerably in the colouring, according to the idiosyncrasies of those who have sketched them: some landscapes, being from first to last of a sombre hue, that of universal blame and dissatisfaction; others, of a more chequered aspect, admitting patches of light here and there amid the shades; a very few bearing a roscate tint throughout. But, on the whole, the general impression they leave on the mind is, that the provincial populations, though not devoid of capacity for better things, are at present condemned to wither under a general atmosphere of maladministration and decay.

Next we turn to the recitals of travellers and foreign residents, such as his the title of whose work heads the Review; their number is legion, male, female, learned, unlearned,<sup>2</sup> British, French, American, from the days of Hamilton, of quarto volumes and mezzotints, down to those of small octavos, vignettes, and gilded covers. Here the verdict is still more various. From the enthusiastic Turcophile, with whom the turban is a coronet of nobility and the mosque the symbol of sanctity, to the unsympathetic American, we have every grade of admiration and of disgust.

It could hardly be otherwise. Turkey, the battle-field of so many nationalities, interests, and creeds: the tangled skein of so many, and, we may add, such rotten, threads: the twilight, not, however, the 'morning' land between East and West, civilisation and barbarism, Europe and Asia, claimed by each, belonging to neither, is, of all regions, the one least likely to escape in its portrayal the false colours of prejudice and the touches of misconception. Every visitor who lands on the Turkish shore brings with him a baggage of preconceived theory on 'the Eastern Question,' or, 'the Cross and the Crescent,' or, 'the Semitic races,' or, 'the Sick Man:' and, as he has already viewed Syria or Anatolia from his study or club-room, so he will, in nineteen instances out of twenty, view it from the forest-clothed summit of Mount Olympus or the bare slopes of Anti-Lebanon. In short, the politician, the dilettante, the missionary, the European, the American, each will see unlike the other, and as each sees so he will report.

Of

Of this the book before us is an instance in point. Truthful, even to minuteness where he pictures the interesting towns of Amasia, Tokat, Sivas, and Angora: excellent in his notices, geological or otherwise, of the country and landscape around; accurate and ingenious, if not always critically correct, in his descriptions of the strange sculptures of Pterium, Eyook, and the Niobe of Mount Sipylus, and his dissertations on their antiquity and meaning, Mr. Van Lennep is incapable of appreciating at its due value the character of any Eastern race, or of understanding Eastern institutions and manners, still more so of passing a reliable judgment on them. As an American his mind has no point of contact with the Oriental; as a Protestant missionary he condemns, not Mahometanism only and its followers, but every description of Christianity except his own with a narrow-mindedness worthy of Archbishop Manning or the author of the 'Syllabus' himself.

Regarding the relics visited and illustrated by Mr. Van Lennep, and of the countless others that belong to the same, or later, some even to earlier, dates, that abound in the centre and east of Asia Minor, we have no leisure here for more than a passing notice. Temples and tombs, in the style and ornamentation of which no feature indicates the almost pre-historic race that hewed them in the living rock: others like those of Eyook, semi-Egyptian in their character; others, again, manifest Assyrian; Pontine carvings, where the influence of Greek art is occasionally visible; Roman, Byzantine, Seljookian, Turkoman constructions, each a history in itself: of these not a half, not a quarter even, has yet been properly investigated. Suffice to say that an Exploration Fund would have at least as worthy an application, and as satisfactory a result, in Asia Minor as in Palestine.

Leaving, though with reluctance, the interesting field indicated, but far from exhausted, in the antiquarian chapters of Mr. Van Lennep's book, we come to the author's strictures and animadversions on the Turkish Government and race, or races rather, for there are many subdivisions, all of which are referred by the similarity of their leading characteristics to something of a common stock. Here some of the writer's remarks are manifestly dictated by the ignorance which arises, not from want of experience but of sympathy. But some of the accusations made coincide in the main with those brought by other less biassed but not less serious authorities; and, on this account, deserve impartial investigation.

They are soon summed up. 'Beggars all, beggars all; marry,  
z 2 good



good air.' Little doing, less likely to be done; trade degenerated into pedlary, enterprise into swindling, banking into usury, policy into intrigue; lands untilled, forests wasted, mineral treasures unexplored, roads, harbours, bridges, every class of public works utterly neglected and falling into ruin, pastoral life with nothing of the Abel resemblance about it, agriculture that Cain himself, and metallurgy that his workman son might have been ashamed of; in public life, universal venality and corruption; in social life ignorance and bigotry; and in private life immorality of every kind; not 'something,' but everything rotten in the state of Turkey: such is the picture. We may add it is hardly an overdrawn one.

Yet the eye of a close observer may detect many and unmistakable indications that the general decrepitude of provincial Turkey, and of Asia Minor in particular, is not due to any native and inherent cause either in the population itself, or in the physical circumstances of the climate and land. We need not cite for this purpose the historical records of Turkish, and notably of Anatolian prosperity, nor appeal to the half-effaced traces of industry, vigour, art, and order that silently witness even now to an era of better things continued as late as the first half of the eighteenth century. It is enough to have passed some years of life in Asia Minor, and in the very districts visited by Mr. Van Lennep himself, to know by experience that the population, the Mahometan portion of it we mean, town or country, is, as a rule, industrious, simple, thrifty, ingenious too, peaceable, and orderly; that if strongly attached to their own religion they are tolerant of other creeds and practices to a degree rarely attained even in Europe; and that, with individual exceptions, they are as free from the grosser and worse forms of vice and crime as any nation under the sun. That they enjoy a climate than which few are more favourable to labour and produce; that the soil is almost everywhere fertile above, and rich in valuable ores below; that the coast abounds with places of shelter; and the inland with noble rivers, are facts which no one will question. Yet, amid all these advantages, it is no less certain that capital has vanished from the land, that every undertaking, every enterprise, commercial, industrial, agricultural, or other, is surely smitten with failure; that the social condition is deteriorating in every respect, the number of the inhabitants diminishing, and that the symptoms precursive of a general bankruptcy, not of means and finances only, but of vitality and of men, become more menacing year by year, almost day by day.

What then is the cause of these things? If it does not lie  
either

either in the country or in the inhabitants themselves, where is it to be sought?

In the opinion of not a few, 'Mahometanism' would be a sufficient answer to such a question. The intolerance of the Koran, say they; the antagonism it proclaims to civilisation and progress; the fanaticism it inspires; the barbarism of the practices it permits or sanctions—slavery, divorce, and polygamy, for instance—these are the stumbling-blocks in the way of Turkey; and by their removal alone can she hope to advance on the better path. But strange as the assertion may seem, the only hope for the duration of Turkey as a united empire lies in her allegiance to Islam. We have seen old ruins deprived of almost every architectural prop, and seemingly ready to fall asunder from hour to hour into formless heaps, yet held together in seeming defiance alike of gravitation and time by the dense ivy that clusters round and binds them. And thus it is with the tenacious, so-called bigotry of the Mahometan populations. Without a caliph, for Mahmood II. and his successors forfeited long since, at least in the popular estimation, all claim to that title; without a hierarchy, a thing of all ages unknown in Islam; without the once famous and richly-endowed schools of learning and piety; without a single teacher or instructor worthy of the name through the length and breadth of the Empire, they yet cling to their creed as firmly as did its first followers, and to the system of which that simple, powerful creed is the corner-stone, and show no more signs of abandoning it in its cloudy, than they did in its sunny days. Their national institutions have perished; their Sultan has become to them as a stranger, and his Government the mere expression of bureaucratic rapacity; their substance has been consumed by taxation, their homes by usury, their children by conscription, their lives by injustice; yet this one link binds them together, and centres them in the memory, the tradition, of Osman and Stamboul: a gathered crowd on the isolated peak of Islam, they stand still and gazing on the faint reflected shimmer of the Crescent, for ever set beneath the Western horizon; and in that gaze are one.

No traveller in the Turco-Asiatic provinces can have failed to remark the significant fact that, however squalid the town streets, however miserable the hamlet, one building in village or town is sure to be solidly constructed, well kept, swept, garnished, and even decorated; and that building is the Mosque. While elsewhere the native architects seem incapable of constructing one wall at right angles to another, or of bringing two house-fronts into symmetry; while heaped-up rubbish and all manner

of

of refuse cumber the broken pavement of the common way; while the plaster flakes from off the house walls, and the broken windows of the dwellings are stuffed with filthy rags; here in the mosque close by, the exact angle that ranges all the worshippers with their faces to Mecca has been calculated with the utmost nicety; every part of the edifice—porch, doors, windows, vaulting, is not only maintained entire, but decorated, if not always with taste, at least with care; while all around the place, on the paved paths that approach it, and among the tall trees that, wherever possible, have been planted to overshadow it, the most scrupulous neatness prevails. Morning and evening, Begg, landowners, tenants, ploughmen, artisans, day-labourers, slovenly and unpunctual elsewhere, attend with order, quiet, and precision; while the Friday crowd, with their clean dresses glittering in the noonday sun, attest a regularity, self-respect, and unity of feeling unattainable in any other place, or for any other object.

Nor is the all-pervading influence of Islam less remarkable in every phase of domestic life. Inscriptions of genuine Islamitic character are painted on the outside walls of houses, are traced in gilded letters on the boards framed and hung up within the rooms; at eating, drinking, rising up, lying down; at the greeting in the street, the shop, the field; in every conversation, on every occasion, the one formula is the password for all.

We admit once more that Islam, crystallised as it now is in its later days, presents, not, indeed, a barrier, but a check to progress; that its social code, whether prohibitive or permissive, is inconsistent with the better domestic, and therefore with the most perfect forms, of civic organisation; that it encourages a certain negligence in regard of human duties as compared with theological; and that by the contentment and endurance it preaches, favours a disposition to acquiesce in the lower steps of the ladder; thereby in a measure discouraging men from endeavour after the higher. But Mahometanism has two, seemingly antagonistic, peculiarities: the one, that half-heartedness appears to be impossible in it: its followers are Mahometans all through; the other that, however immovably fixed its centre idea, the circle of theory around it is capable of dilatation to a degree that might startle the broadest divine of our own schools. At once iron-bound and expansive, its formula admits within its range the spirit of a Huxley almost as readily as that of a Suarez: but, while admitting them, it communicates to each its own special tinge. To illustrate these statements would require not an article but a volume: those versed in Eastern literature or in Eastern life will, however, know what we mean.

We said 'so-called' bigotry; for bigotry implies not merely devotedness

devotedness to a creed, but hatred and contempt of those who differ from it; and this is not, broadly speaking, the Anatolian tone of mind. Ignorance and the semi-savagery of isolation may, of course, produce it in individual instances, but in general the provincial Turk, however attached to his own fashion of faith, has no antipathy for those who profess another. We see Christians and Mahometans living socially enough, as for centuries they have lived, side by side, in almost every village, every provincial town of the empire; and should any manifestation of ill-feeling and hostility occur, its commencement will rarely be found on the Mahometan side. Thus, horrible as were the Syrian massacres of 1860, we must not forget that even they were inaugurated by Christian provocation. On the other hand, the handsomest houses, the fairest gardens, the largest warehouses, the best-stocked shops, inland as along the coast, in Central Anatolia as at Meidania or Smyrna, belong to Christians. One Christian is a tithe-farmer, another a public accountant, a third a member of the Provincial Council. Where, then, is the special oppression? or rather where are its effects? Where, even the dislike or contempt? The very word 'Giaour,' out of which so much capital has been made for stereotyped accusation, even official, has, in plain truth, no more offensive meaning than our own 'dissenter,' 'heathen,' or any other term employed to indicate those who differ from us in theological belief; it denotes the follower of some other than the established creed, but, in its ordinary application at least, throws no slur upon the creed itself. In a word, making all due allowance for 'the disgust which every well-constituted mind feels for any form of worship other than its own,' there is not normally more intolerance in Asiatic Turkey than there is in England or Prussia; much less certainly than there is in Ireland or Spain, perhaps even in France.

If, then, the Eastern Christians do not rise to a position of the highest importance, do not get the whole land with all it contains into their own hands, and elbow the 'usurping Moslem' out of it, as it has been so often asserted they would do at no distant date, the cause must be sought, not in their Mahometan fellow-citizens, but in themselves. And we will venture to assert that no one who has known by experience Greek narrow-mindedness and unscrupulousness, or Armenian baseness and rapacity, but will allow that the turn of Fortune's wheel, which should bring these and their like uppermost, would be very far from a beneficial one for Turkey, or those who have to do with her.

Not, therefore, in the land or climate, not in the character of  
the

the dominating races that inhabit there, not in their creed, not even in their bigotry, are to be sought the causes of Turkey's avowed decadence, of her untilled lands, wasted forests, neglected mines, unrepaired or unconstructed roads, broken bridges, desolate coasts: of her diminishing population and increasing indebtedness, of whatever renders her what she actually is—a proverb and a byword among the nations. Yet a true and adequate cause there is; and one all the more fatal in its working that it is still, in spite of accumulated evidence to the contrary, regarded by the ignorance or the partisanship of many in the light of a benefit, not an injury; of an invigorating remedy, not a life-destroying poison. This cause is no other than the so-called 'reform' inaugurated by Sultan Mahmood II., and but too faithfully carried out, especially in its most injurious details, by his successors.

Life, whether individual or collective, whether of an animal or a State, is continuous; discontinuity is only another name for death: nor where this has once taken place can any second form of equivalent vitality be substituted till the original one has passed through absolute and elementary decomposition. A tree will bear much pruning and lopping of its branches, and even sometimes be the better for the process; but no new wood, however cleverly let in, can keep alive a severed trunk; a fresh sprout may, indeed, spring up on the site when years have rotted the bole level to the ground; but it is another life dependent on other conditions; the old one is gone for ever. Even more truly does this hold with a people and its institutions.

Whatever nation violently and abruptly breaks off the tradition link of its origin, forfeits its place among the living and leading ones of the earth; and its spasmodic efforts to enter on a new line of existence can only lead it further and further astray from its true orbit. Macaulays may apologise and Buckles extol, but a Revolution like that of France is at most a splendid suicide; and death, however the convulsions that precede it may for a short period simulate renewed vitality, is not the less certain and complete. If England has up to the present day shown herself capable of throwing off and recovering from demagogues and empiricists, while France and Spain have sunk down from one attempted re-integration after another into what we now see them, it is because the England of one century has never disconnected herself from the England of the century before: and while she has gradually modified, has never precipitately abjured her primal institutions.

To return to Turkey: if we would understand her present condition, we must know what she was in the past. The common

mon idea—one studiously promulgated by the servile press of Constantinople itself and eagerly adopted by those interested in believing it abroad—is, that from an unmitigated despotism, in which the will of an absolute Sultan and the rapacity and brutality of subordinate pashas alone were law; where the population, especially the Christian portion of it, had daily to submit to fresh exactions and cruelties; where might alone was right, violence and injustice the order of the day, and no man could call the head on his shoulders his own, Turkey has at last, thanks to the enlightened energy and reforming zeal of Mahmood II. and his successors, been transformed into a, comparatively at least, free, orderly, law-governed, and progressive empire.

Now, of both these statements it is the exact reverse that is the truth. From a confederacy of half-independent States, each retaining in the main its own customs, privileges, and institutions, guaranteed by a strength to defend them, and by a rough, but efficacious, popular representation, Turkey has within the last fifty years passed into an absolute, uncontrolled, centralised despotism; under which every former privilege, institution, custom, popular representation—in a word, every vestige of popular freedom and local autonomy—has been merged and lost in one blind centralised uniformity.

When, in 1808, Sultan Mahmood ascended the throne, Turkey was not a despotic government; decentralised as she was, she could hardly with propriety be called a monarchy. Within the walls of Constantinople itself, where the barracks of the dreaded Janissaries fronted his imperial portal, nay, within his very palace, where the purchased pages of his own seraglio claimed and often exercised their prescriptive right to organise discontent and mutiny, the Sultan was far from absolute. But outside the capital both he and the pashas who represented his authority were held in restraint by not less than four other checks, three of which had a recognised and, after a fashion, a legal existence; the fourth, not the least efficacious, was due to the circumstances of the times.

For a correct appreciation of the Janissaries, a body that, throughout the empire, in the provinces as well as in the metropolis, held the capricious princes of the moody family of Osman in salutary awe, the reader cannot do better than consult the admirable *résumé* given by Sir A. Slade at the opening of his work.

The Janissaries, originally, as is well known, a purely military institution, had in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by a series of progressive modifications, become a sort of over-

grown

grown and ill-selected popular assembly ; which, however, though turbulent in its proceedings, and often rash and violent in its demands, had yet the merit of being uniformly opposed to the illegal exercise of the sovereign power, to the sale of offices, the debasement of coinage, and the other measures by which the later Osmanlee Court was already doing its utmost to ruin the empire.

Scarcely less powerful to prop a throne or to overturn it than the Janissaries themselves, were the 'Ulemah,' or 'learned men ;' a body of legists, the authorised interpreters of the Koran and of the laws based on it, and not unlike in their position to the scribes and lawyers of the later Jewish nation. These, with the 'Sheykh Islam,' and the two great military judges or 'Kadec-Askar,' the one of Roumelia, the other of Anatolia, at their head, formed a Court of Appeal, to which the Janissaries and their like had frequent resort for the moral and legal sanction requisite to support them in their resistance to the despotic vagaries of their sovereigns. Backed up by the arms of the soldiery and the voice of the people, the decisions of the 'Ulemah' could not be ignored with impunity ; and it is but fair to say that these decisions were generally on the side of right.

Both Janissaries and Ulemah, though powerful in the provinces, had their main lever of action in the capital. But without its walls, and especially in the remoter districts of the vast empire, two other recognised and, one might almost say, constitutional checks counteracted the free exercise of the central power. The first of these was formed by the 'Dereh-Begs,' or 'Lords of the Valley,' so called from the favourite position of their strongholds at the entrance of some mountain gorge, or defile road, whence they levied toll on the passers by. Many of these chiefs belonged to families that had ruled their districts centuries before the establishment of the Ottoman dynasty, from which, in return for services rendered, they had received patents of confirmation in their ancestral privileges ; others, more recent, had been created by the Turkish Sultans themselves. Supported by large retinues of armed followers and vassals, they continued down to the present century to exercise no inconsiderable amount of local authority ; and were the natural opponents of every oft-renewed endeavour made by the capital to drain the provinces to its own exclusive advantage. They corresponded to the feudal aristocracy of the European West.

Next in importance to the provincial action of the Dereh-Begs was that of the Timarlees, or holders of military fiefs ; their number, as early as the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent, amounted to 53,352, and became subsequently even more considerable.

siderable. Originally mere State tenants for life, they gradually rendered themselves, in the majority of instances, hereditary proprietors; till at last they formed an influential landed gentry, conservative, as such always are, and not less disposed to resist royal than other innovations. Collectively taken, the 'Dereh-Begs' and the 'Timarlees' represented the country, as the Janissaries did the town element of the empire; and it was from among their retainers and tenants that were recruited those terrible bands that so often devastated Europe, and twice encamped beneath the walls of Vienna itself.

Lords, commons, gentry, and law, had thus each after their fashion their constituted representatives in the Turkish Empire; and could assert, by force even, if necessary, their prescriptive rights. Taken singly, none of them, the Janissaries excepted, were very formidable opponents to a vigorous despot; but united they were irresistible. And behind them stood a fifth power, unconstitutional and formless, but by no means to be neglected in the calculations of any would-be autocrat—an armed people. Every adult male of those days throughout the Empire had weapons, and knew the use of them. Our own best historians have amply shown how far Lancastrian, Yorkist, and even Tudor monarchs were kept in check by a similar state of things within this very island; and in the far East frequent and dangerous revolts of over-taxed provinces often warned the Sultans of Constantinople that the obedience of their subjects, however extended, had its limits. In a State like this a Pasha or Sultan might be, and often doubtless was, despotic enough among his own immediate surroundings and dependants; but the nation at large, strong in its local and self-governing rights, and in the numerous guarantees, military, legal, aristocratic, territorial, and, if need were, individual, of those rights, had little to fear from a Mehemet Köpreli or a Murad IV. himself.

Of these five restraints on administrative encroachments, four have now been wholly swept away. The destruction of the Janissaries in 1826 is one of the most ghastly, as it is one of the most widely known, facts in modern Ottoman history; it was complete. The Dereh-Begs, isolated and incapable of acting in concert, fell the next victims; some who attempted resistance were subdued by force and put to death; others compromised for their personal existence by the sacrifice of their lands and authority; between 1830 and 1840 the class had ceased to exist. Equally sweeping was the annihilation of the Timarlees: Mahmood by a single stroke of the pen resumed all the fiefs, lands, and privileges granted by his predecessors on the throne; nor  
in



in the majority of instances was the smallest compensation made to the evicted holders. Lastly, a strict prohibition of the private possession or use of arms, a prohibition evaded of course, or resisted in many places at first, and in some few poor and outlying districts even now, but which has been generally carried out in process of time, disarmed the population at large to the sole profit, an illusory one, of the throne. The Ulemah alone remained ; but, without a military accompaniment and the clank of arms, the feeble voice of law and justice rarely makes itself audible to an autocratic ear.

Turkey was now a *tabula rasa*, and Sultan Mahmood, as though to the manner born, proceeded eagerly to inscribe on it, where it lay passive before him, the Alpha and Omega of despotism—a standing army and a centralised bureaucratic administration. The loss of Greece and Algeria, the disconnection of Roumania and Egypt, the semi-independence of Servia, the treaties of Adrianople and Hunkiar Iskelesi, with all the other losses and humiliations that Turkey has had to submit to during the first half of the present century, give the interpretation of Sultan Mahmood's writing, for what regards the outer fortunes of the State : and an Empire converted, like the later Byzantine dominion, into a huge property, exhausted to feed an ever-rapacious capital, explains its permanent meaning for the internal condition of the Ottoman territory itself.

In fact, with the sole exception of bettering the condition of the Christians—that is, of the chief usurers and most unprincipled swindlers within the Empire ; let him who knows the Greeks and Armenians of the Levant contradict, if he can—the Hatti Hamaiyoun has, in regard of all the good things that it so liberally pledged, remained a dead letter. The Administration is more corrupt than ever, justice more venal, popular education more neglected, taxation much heavier, public works more neglected, and the population at large more impoverished and faster dwindling than in any preceding epoch. With an ignorant autocrat, an irresponsible Ministry, a bureaucratic administration, a large standing army, an expensive navy, an *ad libitum* civil list, and no budget, public or secret,—he must be of a sanguine temperament indeed, who could hope for a different national result.

Want of capital is the head and front of Turkey's ills throughout her length and breadth, at the present day ; want of men, the necessary correlative or result of the former, the second. To what degree both of these evils exist in the provinces, and how they have been brought about, will be best understood if we  
visit

visit the very countries and follow the line of route traced out by Mr. Van Lennep, but as observers, not missionaries, and guided by the light of past history and present fact.

This, then, is Central Asia Minor. Here, if anywhere, is genuine Turkey: here are no intrusive consuls, no meddling Europeans, no foreign influence. This is the land of unfettered Turkish institutions, in ancient and modern times alike.

From Samsoon to Tokat, from Tokat to Sivas, from Sivas to Angorah, we may read as we run, in characters reiterated and unmistakable, Turkey's decay and the prime cause of that decay written in the contrast between the old and the new style of administration; and illustrated by the objects around us on either side of the road. It is a melancholy view. On a rising ground, wooded if near the coast—bare of all but grass, if further inland—stand the ruins of a large building, once the residence of the country Beg, the hereditary lord of the manor and governor of the district in one. Every fragment is significant; each stone tells its story. That gap in the ragged outline of broken wall was originally the wide entrance-gate through which the Beg used to ride out surrounded by his men-at-arms and retainers, by whole troops of horsemen, mounted and equipped, some at their chief's cost, some at their own, and all ready at a moment's notice, and no pay in prospect but the booty that each man's sword might earn him, to set off for Persia, for Moldavia, for Hungary, wherever the horsetails might lead them. One hundred, two hundred, three hundred troopers, it might be, from a district that now can hardly furnish twenty or thirty miserable conscripts, dragged away on foot to serve against their will for hire in that most unpopular institution, the 'Nizam,' or regular army. As for horses, the most searching requisition could now hardly collect from out of the whole neighbourhood a dozen lean, raw-backed animals, just possible to mount for a walking pace. Has the land, then, once so prolific eaten up its own inhabitants, man and beast—or why this change? Wait a little, we shall soon learn the reason why.

The gate is broken down, but over the whole extent of the hill summit stretch, some hardly scathed by time, so recent has been their abandonment, others rifted and battered, but by violence from without, the ruins of the mansion-castle. Battlemented walls, thick towers, fortified defences; they may have been erected to baffle rivals; they may also have baffled the Sultan's own emissaries when the messengers came to levy an extra contribution from the province, to the profit of the luxuries or vices of Stamboul.

Through the now fenceless entry we advance into what once

was a wide square court-yard. Here, not half a century ago, was the ordinary place of afternoon resort, here the notables of the neighbourhood, Agha this and Khaneh-dan that, landowners, farmers, traders, often the peasants too, and the day labourers, used to assemble for gossip or business ; the place was open to all. In the large room looking down on one side of the court, where broken window-holes now let in the weather upon the rotting remnants of the planked floor, the Beg had his customary seat, with a few of his relatives or friends ; here he used to administer rough off-hand justice to complainants and defendants ; an informal tribunal, without fees, though not always without bribery and partiality ; but the arbitrary character of which was tempered by the rules and prescriptions of the Koran, often appealed to by litigants or bystanders, and rarely without effect. Nor indeed could the Beg himself, however capricious and despotic by habit and disposition, lightly venture on an overt act of wholesale injustice, especially among his own people and vassals. Public opinion, though despised with impunity from a distance, exercises a heavy pressure on those who live in the midst of it, and where deprived, as in the East, of the wholesome safety-valve of the press, is apt to take very violent and explosive ways of manifesting itself. Nor again is it an uncommon thing, nor one peculiar to a semi-barbarous state of society, that men will sooner acquiesce in the injustice of their own kinsfolk than in the justice of a stranger ; nor did occasional injustice destroy the popularity of a chief if brave, liberal, and ready to defend the interest of his vassals against rival neighbours, or even against the Sultan himself, as not unfrequently was the case.

We continue our survey of that saddest of all sad objects, the crumbling walls of what was formerly a dwelling, and notice the still smoke-blackened vestiges of the wide hearth and spacious chimney-place where the Beg's kitchen once stood. Here simmered the great caldrons full of rice and meat, out of which the many hangers-on of the castle, and principally the ' Deli-kans ' or ' mad-bloods '—madcaps we should say—in other words, the unmarried youngsters of the Beg's retinue, made their daily meals. True, the mutton had not always been paid for, and the rice might have been summarily levied, not without fight shown for it, as a road-tax on some passing caravan. But however acquired, it was ultimately consumed within the district, and to the profit of the district, not sent, as at this day, to Constantinople to build for some half-crazy Sultan or intriguing Minister a new palace of wasteful luxury on the Bosphorus, or purchase on the sly some costly, because  
now

now contraband, specimen of Circassian beauty. Hard words, but we are not writing at random, or without knowledge of facts. But in the former times what was taken out of one pocket was at least put into the other, and the debtor and creditor account between the Government and the people, though unwritten and unregistered, was wonderfully evenly balanced at the year's end.

All up the sides of the green hill, far over the wide Asiatic plain, we see the yet uneffaced traces of irrigation channels, now broken down and dry, while, removed from their original places, and strewn at random over the ground here and there, lie the boundary stones that once marked the limits of fields, since abandoned to weed and bush. At 40 per cent. taxation, and such is the very lowest rate levied by the Stamboolee tithe-gatherers on the Turkish cultivator; if the crop be bad, the percentage may amount to something much higher; agriculture is not a paying business, and such luxuries as irrigation, drainage, manure, and improvements of any kind, are out of the question. The landowner, impoverished and in debt, cannot make them; the Government has very different uses for the money it has taken from him, and will not. Under the Begs the tenantry was sometimes, no doubt, vexed by exactions; but they were not less often relieved by exemptions; the shepherd who lives among his flocks knows each one how much wool they can bear to be shorn of; the distant sheep contractor looks only to his accounts. Besides, here again, the substance of the land, if occasionally extorted rather than gathered, returned again in great measure and by no distant circuit to the producers; this family was fed from the Beg's kitchen; that one had a couple of sons maintained among his troop; a third received reasonable advantages for the crops by the water-channel constructed at the Beg's charge, or the road repaired under his direction; while a bad season lightened from off the shoulders of all alike the burden that would otherwise have sunk them in hopeless debt. Horses, too, were cared for; the cavalry contingent of the district for war against the 'infidels' was fixed, and the quota strictly exacted on occasion by a government that above all was military, and as such could always in time of need command the sympathy and assistance, though not always in time of peace the fiscal and civil obedience of its subjects. Not one of these conditions but is reversed at the present day. Muscovite, Frank, German, whoever lists, may now assail the provinces with the safe assurance that the regular troops once overcome, no further opposition will remain; the people starved, disheartened, disarmed, and thoroughly alienated at heart from a  
Government

Government that is a mere synonym for fiscal exaction, that takes all and gives nothing, that has forsaken the traditions of its youth, and preferred the office of tax collector to that of leader, will offer no resistance. 'If the Russians when they come pay for what they take, they are welcome, and we will supply all they require,' is the common saying of the Anatolian peasant. 'I wish they would come,' is the not unfrequent reply of his fellow. France after Sedan and Metz, but without the levies of the Loire and the Seine, would be but a pale counterpart of the collapse that must await the Turkish Empire after the loss of a great battle or two; no improbable event, should she ever be pitted against an enemy of real military skill. Constantinople alone would, it is likely, rally round the last Othman, as she did of old round the last Palæologus, with the bloody but bootless energy of fanaticism and despair; but the provinces she has oppressed and exhausted in the day of her security, will, in the day of her tribulation, leave her unaided to her fate.

As it is, they have not the means, even had they the will, to do otherwise. Taking our stand again on the ruin-crowned hill, we distinguish in the landscape around us two or three irregular-shaped grass-grown cemeteries, with broken tombstones inclined at every angle, from ninety to zero. The inscriptions on many are scarce fifty or sixty years old. These, and the clump of giant cypress-trees that cast their black obelisks of shadow over them, are all that is left of the thriving villages once near by. The Turkish dead are never laid to rest except in the immediate neighbourhood of the living, so that wherever a graveyard exists a hamlet must be, or have been,—now perished and gone. Want, disease (the invariable attendant on protracted want), emigration, and last, not least, military conscription, have done their work: they are doing it with those who remain.

But not far from the fragments of the old castle stands, or rather leans, a rickety wood and rubble house, ill covered with flaky plaster, every square inch of the outside squalor bearing witness to the poverty and disheartened neglect within. It is there that now lives the nephew or grandson of the lord of the castle, the actual representative of the old ruling family. His lands, his rank, his authority, all have been taken from him; and in compensation he receives, nominally at least,—for when was a Turkish remittance regularly paid?—some five hundred to a thousand piastres, that is, somewhat under 5*l.* or 10*l.* per month from the treasury that has confiscated from his fathers fifty, eighty times the sum; and that is now, from year to year, on the point of discontinuing even this miserable pittance.

What

What are his feelings and those of his kinsfolk, that is, of almost every respectable Mahometan native throughout the district, towards the Central Government, we need not say. Yet even now, when the Beg—for local courtesy continues to bestow on him the title that official bureaus deny—passes on the way, the peasants respectfully salute him, and give more regard and obedience to his suggestions or commands, powerless though he be to enforce them, than they do to those of the sallow, black-coated Stamboolee official sent hither to represent the majesty of the reigning Sultan, Abd-el-Azeez.

There, in the valley below, rises the ungainly, barrack-like house, a run-up shell of lath and plaster, which is the abode of modern officialism. Here resides the governor of the day, whatever his rank, 'Mudeer,' 'Kaim-makam,' 'Mutesarrief,' or Pasha. After long dangles about the waiting-rooms of Ministers and Secretaries at Stamboul, and wasting more money on favourites, writers, pipe-bearers, servants, and sometimes on their masters, in forwarding his suit than he himself cares to avow, he has obtained the post. Its nominal value, if one of the third or fourth category, may be from 5*l.* to 20*l.* a month; if of the better sort it may equal 40*l.* or more; but from this must be deducted, in his own private calculations, half at least of the income of the first year, of which he nominally makes a grateful sacrifice to Government, but which his patron really pockets—a perquisite of office. He himself, already in debt by his enforced largesses while at Stamboul, has had to borrow further to meet the expenses of the tedious overland journey hither on horseback;—a Polish engineer had long since the charge of making a carriage-road, and an Austrian company obtained, three years past, a railway concession; what has become of the funds set apart for these objects, they perhaps can tell, certainly the public cannot. Our new Governor's attendants have undoubtedly done their best to get from the peasants the means of transport, not to mention their food and lodging, by the way, either gratis or underpaid; yet, even after these reductions, journeying with a whole suite and luggage on horseback is expensive work; and for this expense no provision whatever is made by the central office. The Governor, on his part guileless of the geography of his own country as any of Marshal Lebœuf's officers on a frontier campaign, had never so much as heard of the locality to which he has just been appointed till the day he received his nomination; he has not the smallest antecedent connection with it, and no greater interest in or sympathy with those who inhabit it, and whom he is sent to govern, than an average Englishman might have, let us say, with Bolivia and the Bolivians. His whole calculation

is, to remain at the post two or three years, during which he hopes to extort, by fair means or foul, but chiefly the latter, from those he governs enough to enable him to pay off the more pressing of his debts; to send the expected yearly remittances to his patron and his patron's hangers-on in Stamboul; and then to get himself transferred to another, and if possible a better, place, leaving the well-squeezed orange to be yet further squeezed by his successor, whoever that may be.

About the gate of the 'Konak,' or Government-house, are lounging half-a-dozen shabby-looking 'Zabteeyah,' or policemen, dressed in clothes meant to be of European fashion, but badly shaped, torn, out of elbows, and every way disrespectful. Till lately, these men retained the ordinary Turkish costumes of their respective districts, one much better adapted in every respect to the narrow, rough, bush-tangled paths of the country; while the newly-introduced style, besides being awkward and awkwardly worn, has the additional disadvantage of being in itself a warning announcement from a considerable distance to any sharp-sighted vagabond—and such Turkish vagabonds, whose eyes are rarely blinded by 'poring over miserable books,' mostly are—that a policeman is coming, and thereby giving timely notice to escape. This, however, matters the less, that Turkish policemen are generally inclined of themselves to act on the great Dogberry's advice to his Watch, and to let the thief or villain, whosoever he be, show himself for what he is, by stealing himself out of their company, only 'for a consideration.' And in fact, as the provincial police is ordinarily paid at the rate of 80 piastres only, or about 15*s.*, a head by the month, that this microscopic salary is generally several months in arrears, and that out of it, when they get it, they have to find themselves in everything, uniform and arms included, it is hardly to be wondered at if the poor wretches are always on the look-out for remunerative jobs; such, for instance, as laying hold of any one, guilty or not, who is likely to buy himself off for a small sum; and letting all others alone, whatever motive may exist for their apprehension.

Meanwhile throughout a district of, on an average, eight hundred square miles in extent, of which at least half are rock or forest, and consequently form the best possible refuge for any criminal who may desire to evade pursuit, twelve or sixteen policemen at most, of the description and at the wages above stated, are the sole existing guardians of order and law. Half of them are generally employed in collecting the Government taxes, living the while at free quarters in the villages assessed; of the other half some are, as we have seen, lounging about the doors of the Governor's residence; the rest engaged in his private service, or sleeping

sleeping on benches in some coffee-house, playing dominoes, perhaps. That bad pay means bad work, and no pay no work at all, is a truth of which the Ottoman bureaux appear to be as ignorant as some of our own officials.

And here we may remark on the extreme proportional difference between the salaries of the upper and of the lower class of officials in the Ottoman service. It is absurd, startling even; but, under the circumstances, not unnatural. While a 'Walee' or Governor-General receives for what is, after all, very moderate work, the equivalent of four, five, or even six thousand pounds a-year; while the Ministers resident in Constantinople itself, with the strings of the public purse in their hands, write themselves down at ten thousand apiece and more; while the Sultan disdains openly, and his favourites covertly, the restraints of a Civil List, a subordinate Governor, 'Mudeer' or 'Kaim-makam'—to give him his Turco-Arabic title—is lucky if he can draw for as much as three hundred, and his subordinates, in turn, if they get ten or twenty pounds: add to this that, except for obtaining the highest posts, where personal influence or connections may suffice for success, and excepting again instances of notorious and shameful favouritism, the recompense of services best left unspecified in European print, no office, no post, no favour, however small, is to be had throughout the Empire except for money. Every patron, every dispenser of good things, every great man, every Minister—the Sultan himself, one and all—have written up over their doors, not in letters of ink or gold, but in the yet more legible characters of unspoken, universal, irreversible custom, 'To be bought.' Hither come the suitors, a countless throng—for place-seeking grows in a nation as public spirit decays—and the Turks, once of all men the freest from this vice, are now the most widely tainted with it; a hopelessly degraded throng, too; for 'take a turn and mend' who may, it will not be he who has once, in Eastern phrase, 'sold the skin of his face,' i.e., bartered away the blush of shame for office-hunting, little likely ever to brace himself up again to the independence of honest work, or even of honest idleness. The purchase is effected, and the purchaser's next care is to make the most of his business by the retail sale of what he himself has bought wholesale, through every grade and function of his administration. Thus Stamboul is parodied in the 'Konak' of every province, with this difference only, that the former plunders only to retain, while the latter retains indeed some part, but remits more. '*Omnia cum pretio*' might be affirmed of modern official Turkey more truly even than ever it was of Imperial Rome.



Even from a cancer like this cures are, so history avers, on record, in those fortunate instances when a nation has possessed sufficient vigour to throw off after a time the unhealthy element and regain the honesty of public spirit. But such cures are rare; and where they take place presuppose general national activity, great facility at large for entering on more honourable and more remunerative careers, the pressure of public opinion, and a moral sense of better things diffused among the bulk of the population; they presuppose too nobler memories of the past, not wholly disconnected from the present. None of these conditions exist in Turkey; with her place-seeking and corruption are but a natural sequel of the 'reforms' of Mahmood II., of rash empiricism, pseudo-centralisation, and bureaucratic absolutism: they are inherent in the order of things, and have no hope of cure.

Within a dingy, ill-swept, ill-garnished room—for why should he bestow care on the appearance of a place in which he is merely a passing stranger, with no object or interest on hand except to make what money he can out of it, and then leave it?—sits the Governor; his sallow complexion, shabby black suit, and the 'lean and hungry look' seldom wanting in his tribe, announce him a genuine 'Stamboolee.' Scattered before and around him, on dusty floor and worn cushions, lie some dozens of crumpled papers, covered with seals, signatures, and accounts: of these the greater number have reference to Government dues of various sorts; others contain the reports of the various 'mejlises' or tribunals with which the present system has complicated the Administration to the profit of those engaged in it, and the detriment of anything like business dispatch; others, again, belong to the ceaseless stream of nugatory telegrams to and from Constantinople. For the centralising system, with a large supply of telegraph-wires, some few postal conveyances—though both are habitually mismanaged, no secrecy being observed in the former department and no regularity in the latter—and hardly any roads, has naturally resulted in the multiplication of documents, especially telegraphic, to which nobody pays any attention, and of accounts for which there is, practically speaking, no verification.

As to His Excellency the Governor himself, he has learnt the lesson early taught him, that the only thing his superiors and patrons at Constantinople care for, the only chance allowed him of getting into favour or keeping so, his present tenure of office and his hopes of a better in future, are summed up, one and all, in remitting to Constantinople as much money as possible. How it was got no one there will inquire; how it is expended,

expended, those who have seen the country-seats on the Bosphorus and the diamonds in the harems best can tell. Perhaps, as we have heard more than one of this class declare, he had first entered an official life with very different views and intentions; perhaps he then meant to make the welfare of those he was to govern his first object; then he devised measures for alleviating their burdens, improvements to supply their material wants, order, justice, and education, for their social requirements: a programme such as that Fuad Pasha himself might have dictated and Sir Stratford Canning approved. But all too soon experience taught him that official promulgations were meant to be read, not to be acted on; that very different things were expected of him by his employers at the capital; that they cared nothing for the people under his charge, everything for the money to be wrung out of them; and so he, like the rest of his colleagues in office, shaped his course according to the wind.

Unlike his predecessor, the old native Beg, who, almost single-handed, at little cost, and with a Kahiyah, or secretary, and a scribe or two at most, administered the affairs of the district, and yet found leisure to attend to his own, the new Stamboul magistrate has paid assessors by the dozen and salaried subordinates by the score. There is an Administrative Council, a Town Council; sometimes, if near the coast, a Trade and Commerce Council, a Criminal Court, a Civil Court, a Police Court, besides the great yearly meeting of Deputies from all subdivisions of the district or province elected, as such elections go to represent, after a fashion, the inhabitants and their local requirements, generally a bridge, a road, or the like. Of these council members and deputies, one-half is made up by Government nominees, the other half is nominally chosen by the people; but such is the prevailing apathy, itself the ominous expression of political hopelessness, that the popular members, too, are in fact not less designated by Government than are the others. But by whomever these subordinates may have been appointed, they too know, one and all, no less than their chief, that the only projects which will really be attended to, the only suits that will effectually be promoted, are those which go to bring money into the exchequer or into the pocket of those who hold the keys of the exchequer; and they act accordingly. Look at the various council-rooms round the courtyard below; there, in an atmosphere of cigarette smoke, on a divan strewn with tobacco ashes and burnt ends of paper, sit chatting with each other the clerks, or 'Kateebes,' whose name is Legion; all underpaid, if we take account of their individual salaries; overpaid, if we consider the amount of the real work they perform, which,

which, except where money is in question, amounts to nothing, and that nothing always in arrears. Outside the doors stand a crowd of ragged, poverty-stricken petitioners, who have paid away, or are still paying, the last fraction of their wretched savings to the ravenous crew within, in hopes of obtaining that redress for their wants and grievances which experience might have already sufficiently taught them they will never obtain.

A miserable spectacle. But we must not suppose that the indigence of these peasants is exceptional or peculiar to applicants of their class; on the contrary, the men gathered here are only an average sample of their fellow-villagers in mountain or plain, and even, in a large proportion, of the town population itself. Poverty is the rule for both; and if leaving the 'Konak' we take up our post of observation in the best-frequented thoroughfare of any provincial town, even the most thriving, say Samsoun, Trebizond, Sivas, or Angora, and watch the passers-by, a quarter of an hour will often have elapsed before a single decently-dressed and well-to-do individual has come in sight. When he does, it is generally a Christian money-lender. And though the use of plaster in a southern climate, and the beauty of natural surroundings, rarely wanting to an Eastern landscape, often render the general effect of a Turkish town, when viewed from a little distance, pleasing to the eye, nearer inspection rarely discovers a single dwelling that does not bear the marks of premature dilapidation and decay. But in the clay walls and ragged roofs of the village cottages, or rather hovels, no illusion can find place; poverty, sheer poverty, is written in every crevice; and the 'nakedness of the land,' often of its inhabitants too, not metaphorically, but in absolute fact, is without and beyond any veil. Without capital, and without the possibility of acquiring or keeping it, matters could scarcely be otherwise; and throughout the Ottoman provinces capital is not diminishing, it is gone, it is utterly drained away. The first and greatest sluice has been opened by the Administration itself. We have seen that the hordes of officials let loose by the bureaux of Stamboul on the land are, and can be, from the nature of their position, nothing but so many leeches, drawing off the life-blood, partly to their own profit, partly to that of the central pool, whence they have issued. Of the taxation, direct and indirect, but all flowing in a steady stream to Constantinople, whence not a drop circulates back to the land of its source, we cannot say much here; the subject, a vast and complicated one, would require to be treated by itself. Fortunately, more than one blue-covered volume of recent date supplies  
complete

complete and detailed information regarding Anatolian taxation in all its branches; and the statements made by the Consuls of Erzeroom and Trebizond, evidently after accurate and careful research, apply, with slight local modifications, to all the Asiatic provinces of the Empire. From them we learn that the average direct taxation of the peasant stands at 40 per cent., or nearly so, on his actual or possible gains; that of the townsman, who is on the whole less burdened, at about 30 per cent.; while the indirect taxation imposed on both by tolls, pass-papers, market-dues, custom-dues, dues of every kind, besides forced labour, requisitions, and, in the case of the Mahometan population, that heaviest toll of all, military conscription, about doubles the amount in either case. Meanwhile the Stamboul treasury, burdened by an unprofitable and ever-increasing load of foreign debt, ever on the verge of bankruptcy, and ever, by its desperate attempts to maintain an undermined credit, deepening beneath its feet the gulf into which it cannot but fall, puts every expedient into execution to squeeze the very last drop from the over-wrung fleece; carries its fiscal claims backward for imaginary arrears, and fain would appease the anxiety of its creditors by publishing statistics that show the amount collected from the provinces in 1872 to have been greater by a third than that collected in 1870. 'Therefore,' say outsiders, 'it is clear that the resources of the Empire have increased by so much during that interval.' Not so; they are the exigencies and the exhaustion of the Empire that have so much increased, the resources have proportionately diminished. The tree is being cut down, that the reckless owner may gather the last fruit lurking among its branches. When to these things we add the growing depreciation of property, especially real, consequent on the habitual absence of law and justice in the provinces; the expense of purchasing what may hold the place of law and justice from corrupt tribunals, when they can no longer be dispensed with; when we add that, however bad a season may afflict the peasant, whatever commercial crisis the townsman, whatever general cause of distress the whole country, the burden of direct and indirect taxation never varies, except to grow heavier, we may wonder not that the inhabitants are poor, but that they are still alive to be so; not that the provinces are under-peopled, but that they are not wholly desert.

But, as though all these things were not enough, another blight—the ordinary sequence of malgovernment,—overspreads the land, as pestilence follows famine. What the tax-gatherer has left, is gleaned by the usurer. In spite of the fair promises  
of

of the Hatti Haminoun of 1856,\* there exists even now no credit system in Turkey, no country bank, no means of obtaining an advance, except by private loan; no investment, except in such loans; no limit to the terms, no security on the payment. True there is the 'Bourse' of Galata, the 'Ottoman Bank' at Pera, Smyrna, and Beyrout, with a few similar establishments in the principal seaport-towns. But they have no branches in the country; and their operations regard almost exclusively foreign or Government loans, and transactions of a speculative character with mixed European companies, railroad or other; the tendency of which is to draw off the wealth of the Empire, not to husband it; they are not reservoirs, but drains. The peasants, pressed by the claims of the tax-gatherer, the landowner in need of money for improvements, the shopkeeper desirous of outfit, the artisan who would set up or extend his workshops,—are one and all driven into the hands of the private money-lender, generally an Armenian; often himself the tax-farmer of the district, and who, as creditor, has probably under his thumb the principal officials of the province also. Thus between the claims of the Government and those of the usurer, the unfortunate peasant is ground as between an upper and a nether millstone, of which it would be difficult to say that either is the harder. Three per cent. per month is the ordinary rate of Armenian interest; and this, if unpaid, is at the end of the year added to the capital. The day of selling out soon comes; the family emigrates or starves, and the usurer remains ready to pounce on the next comers, and repeat on them the same process as on their predecessors. We have known a single money-lender thus draw to himself the substance and destroy the population of a whole district.

Another evil that naturally follows is, that capital wherever it exists is certain to be applied almost exclusively to loans of this nature, while for productive investments scarce a farthing can be found. A profit of 36 per cent. even at the risks it involves is sure, particularly with Asiatics, to be preferred to one of 4 or 5 per cent. though more solid and made by honest means, such as mining, agriculture, irrigation, and the like. Hence too, as a further consequence, every work of public utility is thrown into the hands of foreigners: foreign capitalists construct harbours, work mines, utilise forests, lay down railroads;

---

\* 'On s'occupera de la création de banques et d'autres institutions semblables, pour arriver à la réforme du système monétaire et financier, ainsi que de la création de fonds destinés à augmenter les sources de la richesse matérielle de mon Empire.'—*Firman et Hatti Sherif*. February 21, 1856.

or, at least, organise companies which profess to do all these things; while the profits, if any, are shared among foreigners and outside the country. Native capitalists, the high-placed official who sells the 'concession' and pockets the fee alone excepted, are passive and take no share. Lastly, whatever home-made capital still remains in the territory is unavoidably, by the very universality of small private loans, so broken up and subdivided as to become practically useless for any serious purpose. Of all the sinister influences at work within the Empire, none is more directly destructive of its internal prosperity, and, above all, of its agricultural and landed well-being, than this.

'Not a single property, great or small, within this district, but is burdened to my certain knowledge with obligations and liabilities exceeding the value of its possible produce for two generations to come,' said a Turkish provincial governor, and confirmed his assertion with an oath. He might have safely added that not a crop was then standing in the field which had not been bartered away in advance, for half its real value, to some usurious lender; probably the very same who had farmed the taxes of the province, and was about to make his additional percentage on this bargain also. But he knew his duty too well to make any reference on the subject to headquarters, where his province and its inhabitants were only represented by their remittances; where their grievances would excite no sympathy, and schemes, however rational, for improving their condition, no interest. Nor was it likely that any of the numerous but obsequious placemen around him, members of councils, tribunals, or boards, each intent on retaining his own position and making his own profits solely, would care to compromise himself with his chief, or at Constantinople, by unseasonable representations to unlistening ears. Meanwhile, should the Governor himself, led by the natural feeling which compels even the most apathetic to take some interest in what immediately surrounds him, desire to alleviate or remedy the evils he witnessed, he would soon find that though all-powerful to take, he was all-powerless to help or give; that, in fact, he could do nothing without an authorisation, for which he might long write and write in vain.

For, as matters stand, except imperial palaces, barracks, Krupp guns, ironclads, state factories, and presents, little other public expenditure is likely to be sanctioned by the central fiat even within range of the Bosphorus, and none beyond it. When the mines of Anatolia are worked, the manufactures of Syria encouraged, the dykes of the Tigris Valley restored; when the bridges, roads, quays, embankments, canals, reservoirs, caravansaries, all that

was

was the pride and profit of local governments, and is now perishing or has perished with them, are repaired and perfected; then indeed will there be hope for the government and the governed, for Turkey and her Sultan. But it is a hope too far off yet even for prophecy.

For this, also, Sultan Mahmood has to answer. When, jealous of power, he destroyed the old aristocracy of the Empire, he destroyed the only class from which a Government worthy the name could be formed; to replace them by parvenus and sycophants—men untrained in the school of family honour, men of expedient and of yesterday, men whose motto could be none other than *'après nous le déluge,'* and their conduct in accordance. Very few, since the beginning of this century, have been the Turkish Ministers who could name with a hope of recognition their own grandfathers: some have themselves risen from the very lowest ranks. Yet it is certain that no man who has not an honour of his own to care for, can safely be entrusted with the honour of others; no one who for half his years has been absorbed in pushing his own interests will bestow the other half in honestly watching over the interests of those entrusted to him. An aristocratic bureau-government, like that of Venice, may stagnate; but a plebeian bureau will soon ferment into the corruption of a New York 'ring' or a Bordeaux committee. And here again is one of the bad lessons Turkey has taken from that most pernicious of political instructors, France; with her she has substituted the aristocracy of intrigue and patronage for that of birth; like her, too, she has sacrificed an empire to a capital; and but for the sabre still girt to the loins, however degenerate, of a son of Othman, and the inherent self-sustaining tenacity of Islam, she would before this have paid a like or an even more fatal penalty.

But the mention of the sabre reminds us of those who should wield it, and we ask what is there in the Turkey of our days to replace the terrible Janissaries, the Sipahies, the Lewends, Akinjees, Segbans, and Gunellees of Varna and Mohacks? And here again we will take our answer from the provinces, and, better than any, from Anatolia itself, where the numerical preponderance of a Turco-Mahometan population renders military conscription at once more regular and more comprehensive than anywhere else. In the European half of the Empire the bulk of the population, being Christian, is exempted, while in Syria, Mesopotamia, and the outlying eastern districts, the Koordes, Arabs, and other wild tribes are apt to exempt themselves from the burden. Thus the entire standing army, reckoned at, though not really attaining, 165,000 men, besides the navy, which may  
require

require about 30,000 more, has to be gathered from a population not exceeding at most 8,000,000 of souls, men, women, and children, thus giving a percentage of about 20 per cent. on the available male inhabitants—a heavy ‘blood-tax.’ We will return for a moment to the modern official residence, the ‘Konak,’ that we have already visited in Central Anatolia; perhaps we may there learn something as to how these things are managed under the present system.

It is early morning, but the courtyard already holds numerous groups of pale, meagre, ragged youths, worthy, to judge by their looks, of Falstaff’s own regiment, awkwardly huddled together among their weeping relatives, decrepit fathers, wrinkled mothers, brothers, friends, come hither from the district round to be present at the ‘Kura’ or ‘lot drawing’ of the annual conscription. For the recruiting party from Stamboul has arrived; the lists of peasant names for a circuit of many miles round have been looked over, and the village headmen or ‘Mukhtars,’ the last feeble remnant of an old self-governing organisation, have received orders to send all eligible youths to take their chance of military service at the ‘Konak.’ There is no fear of any disturbance among the crowd; no excitement, no feeling is manifested except that of unwillingness and reluctance, as ever and anon the shrill voice of some old woman is heard under the little window of the room where sits the recruiting officer, entreating that her Osman, her Mohammed, her Alee, may not be taken from her to be lost in the ranks of a distant ‘Ordoo’; that the last prop of their cottage be not wrenched away; the last fire quenched on its hearth. The young fellow himself makes no affectation of any greater zeal on his part to wear the Imperial livery; he too joins his supplications, even his tears—for the heroes of Asia Minor have no more shame in shedding such nowadays than they had in the times of Troy and Homer—to those of his family; every plea is put forward, every excuse invented, and all not to be a soldier. Nor must this conduct be attributed to disaffection or cowardice; the real motive is the loss which the young man’s absence will cause to those whose livelihood depends in great measure, perhaps absolutely, on his labour; it is fear, not for himself, but for those he leaves behind to want and starvation, a fear too often justified by fact, that draws the tears from his eyes and prompts his entreaties no less than those of his relatives. In vain, his turn has come, the lot has been drawn; in another day he will be marched off to the depot, and when after long years he returns to what was his home, it is well if silent walls and thatchless rafters are not his only greeting.

He



He too will in the meanwhile have undergone a great change, and in some respects one advantageous, not for his relatives indeed, but for himself. The Eastern nature is pliant, almost plastic, and the lad who to-day by his looks, gestures, and cries seems as if he were being led away for immediate execution at least, will, before a year is out, have been by the combined influences of discipline, comrades, and barrack-life transformed into the most orderly, docile, enduring, cheerful, and not the least brave of soldiers.

Without the reckless dash that signalised their onslaught in bygone days; without the terrible enthusiasm, fostered by the consciousness of power, and reinforced by the anticipation of unlimited booty, that animated the besiegers of Vienna and the captors of Bagdad, the drilled and disciplined soldiers of modern Turkey have yet never failed to prove themselves truly possessed of the military qualities most essential to successful warfare alike in every age, modern no less than historic. The annals, even the European ones, of the Crimean war allow their merits; the Danube line and the Asiatic frontier, Montenegro and Candia have witnessed their undiminished courage; nor can any one have visited their camps or accompanied their march without admiration for their patience under privations and their amenability to discipline; qualities not always found in the better appointed, better cared-for troops of European armies. The spirit, too, of Islam, if occasionally languishing in the seaport bazaar or the dissipated capital, recovers much of its pristine vigour in the congenial atmosphere of a camp, and the obedience no less than the courage of the Turkish soldiery assumes an almost religious character,—no unimportant fact in a land where the only nationality recognised, is that of creed. Nor are the ancient traditions of ‘Ghazoo’ or ‘Holy War,’ synchronous with the Arabian Prophet himself, and his injunction of never sheathing the sword once drawn against the infidel wholly forgotten; nor do breech-loaders and clothes of European cut dissociate the soldier of the Turkish ‘Nizam,’ in his own mind at least, from the turbaned warriors who warred sword and spear against the Franks in Palestine. He who does battle with Greek, Russian or European, is still as of old a champion of the true faith; he who falls, though struck down by the bullet of a needle gun, a chassepot, or a mitrailleuse, is a brother-martyr of him who perished more than a thousand years ago by Roman javelin or Greek fire in the days of Heraclius or Manuel. Islam is the one last unsevered link between the Ottoman past and present, between the real and the pseudo-Turkish Empire, and its strongest clasp is in the Turkish army.

Nor

Nor should we forget that the Turco-Ottoman race itself, or rather the races that have united to form its actual bulk, Turks, Tartars, Turkomans, Circassians, and Koordes, have always been emphatically soldier races; for centuries war has been to them the real business of life, other pursuits mere fills-up and pastimes; hence they are naturally at their best when engaged in a profession which, however modified by the progress of the times, is still more congenial to them than any other.

It is worth notice too, what, indeed, has been hinted at by Admiral Slade and other competent authorities, that not only is the army isolated by circumstances of military discipline and barrack-life from the generality of the surrounding population, but that familiarity of intercourse between soldiers and civilians is positively discouraged by those in power. The Sultan, or more properly the bureaucracy which replaces him and acts for him, desire to retain so powerful a weapon exclusively in their own hands. And, indeed, the Turkish military officials are of themselves, and independently of any external influence, very little disposed to intimacy or even friendship with the civil authorities, whom they regard as upstart intruders on their own prescriptive rights; nor without good reason. The Civil Service of Turkey, as distinct from the military, and still more as superior to it, is an entirely modern creation, initiated by Sultan Mahmood II., perfected by his successor, Abd-el-Mejeed, never popular with the nation at large, and positively odious to the army and all in it; who have thus seen more than half their old honours and emoluments transferred to a recent and less worthy rival. To this very antagonism is, however, on the other hand, due the fact that the Ottoman Government of our own time occupies a much stronger position in regard of its own subjects than it did at a former date, when the army was sympathetic, almost synonymous with the people; and thus can now enforce behests, realise exactions, and subdue resistance, in a way unknown before. Much to the advantage of the office-holders, no doubt; not equally so, perhaps, to that of the Empire at large.

Whether this same army may not some day, like the Janisaries of old, though, perhaps, in a less noble and less public-spirited cause, prove a very Frankenstein to the power that has called it into being, is a question of which the answer must be left to time. Symptoms of discontent and insubordination have more than once manifested themselves, especially among the pampered and petted troops massed together in the ostentatious idleness of suburban barracks round Constantinople; and these symptoms have been met, not with becoming firmness and severity,

severity, but with additional pampering and yielding weakness. A dangerous precedent, especially in an overgrown capital and a declining Empire. The evil does not, indeed, appear to be imminent, at least in its more critical forms ; but it exists, and may prove serious before long.

But if we consider the army, not in itself so much as in relation to the Empire at large, we shall find it to be a source of weakness rather than of strength—a peril, not a protection. Subtracted from a poor, insufficient, and dwindling population, every batch of recruits leaves behind it a gap in the labour and resources of the country that has no tendency to fill up ; it is the stock, not the surplus, that is being drawn away from the land. Thus we have in the military conscription a direct cause, acting in concert with the two chief indirect ones already noticed, namely, maladministration and usury, for that visible decay of the Mahometan population about which so much nonsense has been said and written. The while, on the contrary, the Christian races, the Greek and Armenian especially, though not a whit more virtuous than their Turkish fellow-citizens, nor, though monogamists, more physically prolific, but exempt from conscription, shielded too in no inconsiderable measure by the fostering care of consulates and embassies from the ill-effects of maladministration, and themselves the lords and exactors of usury, not its victims, have full play to increase and multiply, as they do, on every side.

Lastly, the nation, taught to consider itself as distinct from the army, and in a measure at variance with it, has also learned to regard the defence of the Empire as no part of its duties, and is disposed to take no share in it, come what may. Take, as an instance, Anatolia, than which few countries are better adapted by nature for guerilla warfare ; few, where an enemy, cut off from supplies and harassed by a hostile peasantry, would find it more difficult to advance. Yet the resistance experienced there by Paskievitch in 1829, and by Mouravieff in 1855, was simply co-extensive with the ground occupied by the regular troops opposed to them ; nor would it be a whit more general at any future date. This apathy is by no means peculiar to Anatolia ; it is the same, or even deeper, in the other provinces ; a serious consideration for an Empire with so open a frontier-line both by sea and land as Turkey.

‘ Our soldiers are excellent ; our regimental officers, up to the rank of captain, tolerable ; our field-officers wretched ; our general officers as bad as can be ; and the highest up and oldest are the worst of all.’ In these words a Turkish field-marshal, in command of one-sixth of the entire Ottoman army, a man of judgment

judgment and experience, summed up the condition of the service to which he belonged. Nor was this verdict,—one to which those best acquainted with the subject will regretfully subscribe on every point,—given twenty, or thirty years ago, when the newly-established system might have been reasonably supposed not yet to have had time sufficient for freeing itself from old defects and abuses, but last year only.

What, then, is the reason of so marked a difference of efficiency between the Turkish soldier and the Turkish officer? and whence the superiority of the former in his line over the latter in his? The circumstances and the training of each supply a sufficient explanation.

The duties of a common soldier are easily learnt, and are, besides, of a character eminently congenial to an Eastern, and still more to a Mahometan, recruit. No better training-school for endurance and privations of every kind can be imagined than the ordinary life of a young Turkish peasant. Bred on the rugged slopes of Lazistan, or the wind-swept plateau of Sivas, cold, heat, rain, hunger, thirst, fatigue, exposure, want, have been the familiar companions of his earliest years; his daily meal a piece of maize-bread, his clothing rags; his bed, the damp floor of an ill-thatched hut: the roughest campaign could hardly exact more of his youth than home life has already of his boyhood. In addition, and as if in special view of a soldier's career, respect and obedience to his elders and those above him have been his earliest lessons; the often-recurring ceremonies, one might almost say gymnastics, of the five stated prayers, performed now alone, now in company with others, have brought him half-way on his drill; and the stories told by his neighbours of the Meccan pilgrimage, though he himself may not have shared in it, have accustomed his mind to ideas of distance and danger. Lastly, he is a sincere Muslim—the poor, whatever their form of religion, are generally sincere in it—and Islam is a proselytising, and, therefore, by a necessary consequence, a pugnacious creed. It would be harder to make a bad soldier than a good one out of materials like these.

Much more complicated are both the duties and the training of an army officer. In physical vigour and endurance he ought scarcely, if at all, to yield the palm to the soldier he commands, while in intellectual acquirements and moral standard he ought, of course, to be considerably above him. Now in modern Turkey the social class from among which a young officer is the most often recruited, is one the children of which are brought up in hareems, and pass through their boyhood with no more idea of gymnastics than the students of an Italian '*collegio*' or French '*petit*

'petit séminaire ;' sallow-faced, flabby lads, with regular but spiritless features ; much addicted to premature cigarettes, cards, and vice ; but guiltless of any single form of exercise or amusement enumerated in the Index of the 'Boy's Own Book,' or practised by the youngsters of an English or German school. Petted and spoiled from their earliest days, these striplings have little respect for age and less for authority : their nearest approach to a journey has been a saunter along the 'Grande Rue' of Pera, or a feeble canter on the Beyook-Dereh road ; fatigue, hardship, and danger, are things scarcely known to them even by name ; the only ideas with which the intercourse of their elders has familiarised them are 'Bourse' transactions, intriguing, jobbing, and profligacy. Their very Islam is vigourless ; French associates, vermouth, and cards have not, perhaps, wholly effaced, but have dulled and blurred its characteristic impressions ; the 'café' is more familiar to them than the mosque, the card-table than the prayer-carpet.

Thus prepared, but with no other primary education, ignorant even of his own language, so far as its grammar and literature are concerned, without an idea of history, geography, or any science whatsoever, the town-bred boy is sent to the military College of Constantinople. Entered there, he has to pass the first and the most valuable of his 'learning years'—to borrow a convenient German phrase—in acquiring initial rudiments of education which a European child of his age has picked up at home, perhaps at his mother's knee, before ever his name figured in a school list. At last, after much and irretrievable loss of time, our young Stamboolee arrives at the special sciences of his future profession. Here his lessons are dictated to him by professors—French, Italian, and Turkish, mere speculative teachers themselves, unskilled in the practical application of the very sciences they dictate : often ignorant and dishonest teachers too, with no object in view except their own salaries and what personal advantages they may be able to procure for themselves one way or other out of their pupils. As to the lessons, delivered mechanically and rehearsed by rote, they are exercises of memory, little more. Knowledge thus acquired is hardly likely to be kept up by private study in after-life : and, as a matter of fact, books, manuals, and diagrams form no part of a Turkish officer's baggage, whatever may be his occupation. Besides, any slight interest that an inquiring and intelligent pupil might possibly take in his theoretical studies, is quickly neutralised by the great practical lesson that he soon learns within the walls of the college itself ; namely, that not proficiency, not merit, but favour, connection, and intrigue, are the  
sole

sole real arbiters of his future advancement. He sees military rank, even of the highest grade, conferred on lads around him nowise better, perhaps decidedly inferior, to himself, merely because this one is the son of a Pasha, that of a Minister, a third of a favourite at Court. One boy, though still a dunce on the scholar's bench, is decorated with the insignia of a colonel, another with those of a general; while he himself, toil as he may, is (if patronless) fortunate should he, at the close of his studies, obtain a sub-lieutenancy; in which poorly-paid grade he may linger for years, till some lucky chance, or sheer length of service, perhaps brings about his tardy promotion.

School and college days are those that more than any others mould the entire character of after life: and he must be dull indeed who cannot from the picture just given of the first scenes in a Turkish officer's 'progress' image out those that follow to the end of the vista. But neither public nor even professional spirit, neither attention to the duties of rank, nor self-discipline and preparation worthily to perform those of a higher position when acquired, must find place in the series. As the career began in superficiality, favour hunting, and idleness, so it will continue, so it will close: and individual exceptions for the better will be unable to correct, or even modify, its original and prevailing tenor. To sum up, a Turkish officer, especially a young one, is tolerably sure to have in a marked degree one, and one only, good quality, that of easy, good-natured kindness to his men: he is also, particularly if advanced in age and rank, still surer to have two bad ones, to the full as distinctly marked: they are profound ignorance of whatever regards his profession and carelessness about learning or practising it.

'Better a herd of sheep led by a lion than a herd of lions led by a sheep,' says the old proverb; and, with slight modification, it is applicable here. Hence, in spite of all the excellent military qualities, physical and moral, still existing in the lower ranks of the Turkish army,—in spite of an enthusiasm not wholly dimmed and something of the old warlike fire of Islam—the future of that army, officered as it is, when put to the test, can hardly be considered doubtful. Gravelotte, Sedan, and Metz have shown what the best and bravest troops may come to when they have a Maréchal Bazaine at their head; and Sedan and Metz will be, not re-enacted, but outdone, on the plateaus of Anatolia or the defiles of the Balkan, should Providence ever assign to the Ottoman Empire what has been spared it thus far, namely, an adversary who shall be at once a good tactician and shall bring to the contest a well-appointed army.

Mention of the military schools and of their defects, or rather  
 Vol. 137.—No. 274. 2 B of

of their utter inefficiency, suggests another topic, regarding which, for its very vastness, we would gladly keep silence, yet cannot wholly omit in a review like the present; namely, the general condition of public education among the Mahometan population of the Empire, particularly in Anatolia. We will be as brief as the subject permits.

‘My people perish for lack of knowledge,’ said a prophet of old times: and could the great Arabian preacher, whose comprehensive mind, if Mahometan tradition says true, anticipated the advantages of learning and the dangers of ignorance for his followers, witness the actual state of the Ottoman provinces in this respect, he would assuredly reiterate, and even intensify, his Hebrew predecessor’s complaint. It would be all the more bitter that, however badly these things may have gone in Judæa, they were not at any rate always thus in the land of the Crescent.

How they now are we will judge for ourselves. Accordingly we pursue our imaginary, yet over-real, journey through the ‘little-known parts of Asia Minor,’ in company with our missionary guide, Mr. Van Lennep. We halt beneath a grove of tall trees, evidently planted here long ago by human care, just outside some country town. Looking round us through the leafy screen that once afforded a pleasant shade to crowds beneath, we observe, rising from some broken lichen-stained steps, an open archway hung with creepers; above it a stone tablet let into the brickwork bears a half-defaced inscription commemorating the piety and liberality of a Kara-Osman Beg, be it, or a Seyyid-Oghloo Ibraheem Agha, who in the year of the Hejrah 1132, that is to say, in the early part of our eighteenth century, erected and endowed the building that those trees sheltered and to which that door gave access. We enter: round three sides of the grass-grown court within are ranged the empty rooms; some, the larger ones, were destined for the use of professors; others, mere cells, gave habitation to the resident students, who were drawn mostly from the poorer classes; in the centre of the court stands the cracked and waterless basin of what once was a fountain; the fourth side of the quadrangle is occupied by the extinguished hearths of the great kitchen. This court, these rooms, it is but half a century since, belonged to a flourishing provincial ‘Medreseh,’ or college, and were frequented by some thirty or forty white-turbaned youths, who, at the trifling expense of an occasional tribute-present to their professors, were instructed in the refinements of their own native literature, accompanied by something of the history of their country and empire, besides Arabic and even a little Persian; and, above all, in the theologico-legal learning, which  
has

has always been of such high repute in the Mahometan East. Studies like these then led to employment and distinction, and many a name honourably inscribed in the annals of Ottoman greatness had first been registered on the muster-roll of students in just such a 'Medreseh.' But the revenues by which the teachers were paid and the college supported were unfortunately derived from lands of Government grant, bestowed by Sultan Seleem, or Suleyman, on the founder's ancestors, in return for the prowess of their sabres on Hungarian or Wallachian plains. Later seraglio-Sultans, inappreciative of services that are now, by the contrast they suggest between past and present, more like a reproach than a merit, have resumed those lands, but have forgotten the bequest attached to them. Scholars, professors, and the culture they represented are, in consequence, gone from the district, which now contains scarcely an individual capable of signing his own name decently.

True, the learning formerly taught in that crevassed hall was old-fashioned, narrow, and of a speculative rather than a practical bearing: stationary, in a word, not progressive in its character and tendency. But why root up the trunk on which more fruitful grafts might so easily have been made? A well-endowed, widely-distributed network of educational establishments existed all over the land: the chairs of the professors, the benches of the scholars, were ready placed in every district. With moderate encouragement from Government and under judicious direction, other branches of knowledge and science, more in accord with the conditions of the age, might also have been taught from those chairs; and the now empty benches would thus have been filled by pupils more patriotic, perhaps more fervent in their Islam, certainly more capable, more energetic, more adapted to every public and social duty than the ignorant, apathetic, unawakened youths of actual Anatolia. So argued the Seljook Sultans when they erected the noble colleges of Erzeroom, Sivas, Kaisareeyah, and Koniah; so, too, the genuine heirs and successors of Osman when they protected and encouraged the countless schools of which we have here selected a random sample; it exists at the country-town of Ispir, in the deep, savage ravine of the torrent of Chorook. But—

'Sure if dulness owns a grateful day  
'Tis in the shade of arbitrary sway;'

and the bureaucratic despotism introduced by Mahmood II. and developed by Abd-el-Mejed has, like that of the Second Empire in a neighbour land, no better auxiliaries than the ignorance and incapacity of those it governs. None know, or at least feel,



this more intimately than the speculation-fed clique of Stamboul; and the stereotyped Ministerial utterances, in French especially, about the desire that animates the Porte for the education and enlightenment of its subjects, whatever credence such fine speeches may obtain in high places, are, and are meant to be, nothing more than tubs to the European whale of newspapers, diplomacy, and Pera. In the provinces seclusion safely dispenses with such disguise; and there the Ottoman Government has gladly seen the torch of knowledge flicker and go out for want of feeding, and has even occasionally stamped on it when it would not go out quickly enough of itself.

Room would fail us were we to attempt the description of the shameful neglect into which has fallen the 'Mahalleh' system—that of the primary schools erected centuries ago by the 'Sultans of the tent,' not the Sultans of Bosphorus palaces, in every town-quarter, every village, every hamlet, of the Empire; nor will we dwell at length on the most lame and impotent conclusion to which, brief as their career has been, have already arrived the newer 'Rusdeeyah' schools, professedly set on foot to fill up the gap left by the ruin of the old educational institutions. Suffice to say that in the provincial Mahometan districts public education has practically ceased to exist, and that private education, once far from uncommon or unsuccessful, has fared little better. The father who desires the advancement of his children is too well aware that the road they must follow in pursuit of success lies elsewhere: other portals, sufficiently specified already, may be frequented: but the portal of much study can lead the young Ottoman now to nothing but weariness of the flesh, and of the spirit too: and can we wonder if few there be which go in thereat?

Enough: who wishes may add details and multiply facts on these and kindred topics from the sources we alluded to at the commencement of this Article. It is time for us to sum up the account and strike the balance.

An overgrown, unprofitable capital, with several palaces and palatial residences, but without quays, landing-places, water-supply, or drainage; a show fleet of ironclads safely moored off the toy-seraglio of Emirghian, but strangers as any river-boat to black water, let alone blue, outside the Straits; an army officered as we have already described it; a still more numerous black-coated host of civilian Pashas and Effendees, licking up all that is round about them, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field; and a load of foreign indebtedness at which the boldest financier of Vienna herself might well stand aghast: these are the acquisitions the Empire has to show from the epoch of Sultan Mahmood

Mahmood II., the destroyer of the Janissaries, the reformer of the Empire, up to the present day. These she has gained; and in their lieu she has lost Greece, more than half-lost Wallachia, Moldavia, Servia, and Egypt; she has sacrificed the vitality, material, intellectual, and moral, of her yet remaining provinces; she has rendered her Government a tree without roots, her empire a pillar without props, her existence a diplomatic question. And all this because her rulers have preferred a *coup d'état* to statesmanship, abolition to modification, revolution to reform. The lesson may be read elsewhere, but nowhere more legibly than in Turkey, most legibly of all in the Asiatic provinces that bear her name.

Yet while we admit the full significance of these things, let us beware of the common error of those who imagine that because an empire is decrepit it is necessarily short-lived; that because national death is morally certain, it is, therefore, near at hand. With individuals, even with families, events of this kind succeed each other rapidly enough; but nations move more slowly, and their downward, no less than their upward, course is measured by long stages and interrupted by many halts. Indeed, the very causes that have rendered the Ottoman Government a blight and a ruin to its subjects, the Mahometans foremost, have also, so long as it remains unmolested from without, a decided tendency to prolong its intra-territorial existence; for the very exhaustion of the subject populations ensures their submission; and narrow-mindedness, consequent on ignorance, removes the danger of union between the various classes and races of the Empire in a common attempt to shake off the common yoke. Attempts, too, like that made by Mehemet Ali and his talented stepson, are not likely to be renewed nowadays by the Khedive of Egypt or the Pasha of Bagdad; nor, if renewed, could they, unless powerfully aided from without, meet with any lasting success. Lastly, in Islam, and its late revival, a phenomenon which has taken many by surprise, but which is no less natural in its causes, though more efficacious in its results, than the contemporaneous religious revival in some parts of Europe, we have an additional guarantee for the prorogation of the death signal of the Turkish Empire.

Meanwhile we, who, in the public opinion of Europe at least, and to a certain extent in our own, are more or less pledged to maintaining the integrity and existence of that Empire, may not find it a waste of time to consider not only how far our interests and those of our vast Asiatic dominion are bound up with Ottoman destinies, but also what modern Turkey, the Turkey of Mahmood II. and Abd-el-Azeez really is; how far she is likely  
ever

ever to make good her solemn promise of amendment, and to become a thing of honour, not of discredit to her supporters; or rather whether by non-fulfilment of her part of the contract she has not virtually absolved us from our own, and left us free to inquire whether we may not frankly and unblamed, in the eventuality of an Eastern crisis, seek in it exclusively our own advantage, and that of those we govern, rather than cling to the illusive memories of the past, and the yet more illusive hopes of an improbable, perhaps impossible, future.

That the Christian races will ever assume the dominant position at present occupied by the Mahometan within Ottoman territory, and, above all, on Asiatic ground, is a supposition that no reasonable man acquainted even moderately with the Greeks and Armenians of the Levant can entertain for a single moment. That a dominant bureaucracy and an autocratic sultan will ever replace on their own necks the constitutional restraints that they have themselves with difficulty broken off, and by so doing give at last one trustworthy pledge of good government, progress, and prosperity, is to the full as unlikely. That all, or any single one, of the nationalities or classes included within the limits of the Empire will have the power, or even make the attempt, of re-imposing such restraints in view of the public welfare is, in the opinion of those who best know the country and its inhabitants, absolutely out of the question.

What degree, then, of support we may in future accord the Ottoman Empire must be measured, not by its own merit, but by our own necessity or advantage; and be weighed, not in the wanting balances of Turkey herself, but in the truer scales of British interest and Asiatic welfare. For taking that measurement, for poising those balances, the time may be far distant; it may also be very near to come. Diverted by the giant eddies of the Centre and West, the European current has of late years set in another direction, and has left the deep waters that surround Turkey comparatively calm.

But that great current will return Eastward again, and when it does, it needs must overflow and sweep away the huge, venerable, rotten trunk that still rears itself erect above the level. The Sultan's dominion, like the Papal monarchy, to which, in its modern form, it bears a strong resemblance, is an anomaly, an anachronism; in both antiquated pretensions have been intensified by the worst expedients, borrowed from the spirit of modern pseudo-Cæsarism; in both centralisation has ruined the land and its inhabitants alike to the profit of an out-of-date autocrat, a selfish Administration, and an ostentatious capital. Such things bear within themselves the sentence of their own condemnation.

Already

Already executed on the elder criminal, that sentence, though delayed, cannot fail of ultimate execution on the younger; and to hinder or delay it is no part of England's duty. Greatly as the Roman States have already benefited by the exorcism of the ecclesiastical incubus that had brooded over them so long, still greater will be the relief and resuscitated prosperity of Anatolia and her sister provinces when the fiscal blight of bastard Ottoman officialism clears off from the fairest regions of the Mediterranean East, never to overshadow it again.

When that hour comes, let the Ottoman Empire fare as it may, England's policy is clearly traced out for her beforehand by the exigencies of her own great empire. To Russia, mistress of the Central Asiatic line, belong of necessity the destinies of Northern Turkey: they are already in her hands. Her Asiatic policy, long consistent throughout, now draws to completion. One foot planted on the Amoor boundary line to the east, and the other on the Caucasian Isthmus to the west, she has gathered up in her unrelaxing grasp the two extremities of the great Tartar route; her latest campaigns have cleared away the obstacles interposed midway; while, by her celebrated note of October 1870, she demanded, and by the Conference of January 1871 obtained, that the key of the whole mid-Asian system, the Black Sea itself, should be placed henceforth within the reach of her hands, ready to wrench it, whenever the hour strikes in the councils of St. Petersburg, from the feeble grasp of the Osmanlee, and to make it all her own. That she will, sooner or later, thus wrench it; that the Russian flag will float supreme over every port on the Black Sea coast; that it will even one day wave in sovereignty from the towers of Galata and the Seraskierat; is scarcely less certain than that the sun once risen in the east will move onward to its place in the western heavens: a wonder-working Joshua may perhaps delay, but cannot reverse its course.

What Russia is to Central, that are we to Southern Asia; it is our inheritance, the reward of our consistency in act, if not in purpose. We, too, have almost reached the goal; and the very events that will ultimately award the Black Sea to our northerly ally, will, we can hardly doubt, decide for us also into whose hands the key of our choicest possession, the Southern Asiatic route will fall. For, once again, what the Black Sea is to Russia, that to us are the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. From Muscat to Yokohama the Indo-Chinese line is ours: the completion of that line, its last, and because its last, its most important, connecting link is formed by the coasts of the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. To these shores must all our attention—as much, at least, as we can spare from disestablishing Churches  
and

and marrying our sisters-in-law—be directed, when the Crescent vanishes from them in its last eclipse; and unpardonable indeed will be our weakness, our negligence, or our folly, if a single harbour, a single roadstead along their extent, acknowledge in that day any sovereignty but our own; if not in our name, at least in that of a supple instrument or a docile vassal.

From the inhabitants of those regions we have more reason to anticipate a friendly welcome, all Giaours though we be, than to fear active opposition, or even passive ill-will. A Mahometan population can acknowledge no worthier sceptre than that which already shelters in peace and prosperity nigh thirty millions of their brotherhood; nor have any rulers of the earth a fairer claim to the inheritance of the Fatemite and Abbaside Chaliphs, to Cairo and Bagdad, than ourselves, the lords of Ghaznee and Delhi, the heirs of Mahmoud the Conqueror and Akbar Khan.

Time must show, thought may already foreshow, what facilitations will offer themselves, what obstacles will block the way; nor, less, how the former may be availed of, the latter anticipated or removed. But it is not too much to say that the last hour of Ottoman rule will also be the first in a new and a decisive era for our own dominion; that the shock which casts down in final ruin the throne of Orkhan, will also loosen the Asiatic diadem from England's head, or fix it there with new and lasting firmness. True this is no work for theorists and Quakers, for arbitrations and Geneva conferences; but it is a work for England and Englishmen, for the successors of those who planted the British flag at Gibraltar, who unfurled it in Abyssinia, who have maintained it, the hereditary beacon of sound government, justice, and prosperity to rulers and ruled alike, over India and half a world.

ART. III.—*History of the Modern Styles of Architecture.* By James Fergusson, D.C.L., F.R.S. Second Edition. London, 1873.

**M**OST cultivated men profess to have some knowledge of the building art. The knowledge is avowedly but superficial, just a refinement; not a serious acquaintance with the work of men, but a genteel and delicate appreciation of what they call 'the beautiful.' In other words, they know what pleases them, and yet they do not know why, and have no thought or care about the worthiness, or otherwise, of their enjoyment. They possibly have learnt some names of styles, and can, perhaps, distinguish

distinguish more or less correctly what these mean. Their judgment is in favour of some style as 'preferable;' and they pique themselves upon their keen discernment of the special merits and peculiar knack of certain living architects. This is the class and character of those who pass for men of taste, who take the lead in Boards and Church Committees and Government Commissions, and to them is very greatly due the constantly declining state of English art. Our buildings fully justify the estimate that not one 'cultivated man' among ten thousand has sound knowledge and discriminating power in architectural affairs, or an opinion that is worth a moment's confidence. The small minority will testify that this is true, and that the talk concerning art and artists prevalent in good society is generally make-believe and empty prattle.

Such ignorance should be abated. To obtain a thorough knowledge of the methods and the merits of true art would need much time as well as patient industry; but, thanks to Mr. Fergusson, an amateur may promptly gain a large comparative acquaintance with the noble works of ancient builders as well as with the feeble efforts of our modern men. And though, unhappily, a history of modern architecture, with its illustrations, must resemble a museum of morbid and deformed anatomies, relieved, perhaps, by some few seeming miracles of pleasing combination, or of grace of form; yet the discriminating student, reading Mr. Fergusson's instructive work, will not be scandalised, but he will find his interest in the subject constantly increasing as he follows the Historian and admires his ready power of diagnosis and his well practised, though ideal, therapeutic skill. The specimens of art are chosen with sound judgment and a very comprehensive knowledge. The views and plans are interesting, clear, and well engraved, and thus the work is made as systematic as a cyclopedia, as full of information as a handbook, and as amusing as a novel.

But it is more than this. The 'History' is, in fact, a continuous pungent satire on the royal, reverend, and noble victims of the modern system; an exhibition of the monumental follies of the vaunted 'culture of the West,' and a display, as frank as it is enlightened, of the petrified delusions of three hundred years. The climax of the work is in the Preface and the Introduction. Here Mr. Fergusson has concentrated the result of his long study of the modern styles, and he proclaims them all to be mere pomp and semblance, 'vanity and lies':—

'The Styles of Architecture which have been described in the previous parts of this work' [those on Ancient Architecture] 'may be called the True Styles. Those that remain to be examined may in like

like manner be designated the Copying or Imitative Styles of Architectural Art.'

'It is perhaps not too much to say that no perfectly truthful architectural building has been erected in Europe since the Reformation. In modern designs there is always an effort either to reproduce the style of some foreign country or that of some bygone age; frequently both. St. Peter's and St. Paul's are not Roman buildings, though affecting a classical style of ornamentation; and even the Walhalla and the Madeleine are only servile copies. So, too, with our Gothic fashions. Our best modern churches attain to no greater truthfulness or originality of design than exists in the Walhalla, or in buildings of that class.'

'All this degrades Architecture from its high position as a quasi-natural production to that of a mere imitative art. In this form it may be quite competent to gratify our tastes and feelings, but can never appeal to our higher intellectual faculties.'

'Besides this loss of intellectual value, the art has lost all ethnographic signification. So completely is this the case that few are aware that such a science exists as the Ethnography of Art, and that the same ever shifting fashions have not always prevailed.'

Truth and simplicity, and ethnographic value being lost, the charge of wastefulness must necessarily follow:—

'While admiring the true Mediæval Art with the intensest enthusiasm, I cannot without regret see so much talent employed and so much money wasted in producing imitations of it which are erected in defiance of every principle of Gothic Art. Neither can I look without extreme sorrow on the obliteration of everything that is truthful or worthy of study in our noble cathedrals or beautiful parish churches; nor do I care to refrain from expressing my dissent from the system which is producing these deplorable results.'

This is good criticism and sound sense, and so is very much to be commended to the patrons of cathedral 'restoration.'

After a humorous and sarcastic reference to the destruction and defacement that in thirty years have made our churches, abbeys, and cathedrals, in a second sense memorials of the past, Mr. Fergusson declares that—

'All our grand old buildings are now clothed in falsehood, and all our new buildings aim only at deceiving. If this is to continue, architecture in England is not worth writing about; but this work has been written that those who read it may be led to perceive how false and mistaken the principles are on which modern architecture is based, and how easy it would be to succeed, if we would only follow in the same path which has led to perfection in all countries of the world, and in all ages preceding that to which the history contained in this volume extends.'

This volume, and the two which have preceded it, are the  
most

most complete and comprehensive English History of Architecture that has yet appeared. They are particularly valuable as an index to the various schools and styles of architectural work; and if the student will accept them as a warning and a guide, and, rejecting modern buildings as 'deceptions,' will select some 'true' old work to draw and measure parts of it full-size and stone by stone, an unexpected interest will probably arise. A new companionship will be discovered, and where all had seemed mechanical and tame, the stones will soon be felt to be alive. The spirit of the Master-Workman will be manifested in each curve and joint, and even in the very setting of the work. His mental and artistic growth will be revealed; a sympathetic art association will be gained with a true manly simple workman, and with a mind and method utterly removed from the 'refined' impostures that delude our much enlightened cultivated age.

To those but little educated in the ways of art the *Master-Workman* is a mystery. His influence and existence are half doubted, half denied, or wholly misconceived; and thus it seems that he requires some further introduction to society to make his quality, his antecedents, and his expectations fully known, and so to justify his claim to independent recognition and a status in the world. This introduction we propose to give, and we shall show that in the progress of 'true' art the Master-Workman was the pioneer, and made and followed up the path that Mr. Fergusson declares has 'led art to perfection.'

All history tells us that in every scene, or kind, or period of art, whenever it was true, original, and great, the workman was the master. His often questionable social status did not in the least affect his dominant position in the world of art; and if we go to Athens, where art reached its ancient climax, and inquire what were the value and condition of an architect in Greece, Plato has furnished us with a complete reply. He says that 'you could buy' (*πρᾶσι*) 'a common builder' (*τέκτονα*) 'for five or six minæ at most, but a master-workman' (*ἀρχιτέκτονα*) 'not even for ten thousand drachmæ, for there are few of them even among all the Greeks.\*' Thus in Plato's time—and he was born but three years after Phidias had died—the master-workman might in common conversation be referred to as a slave. He was a rare luxury, and so was worth above four hundred pounds, or twenty times the price of a mere labourer. This startling sum is quoted, not for some neophyte or unknown article, but for the very few selected 'among all the Greeks.'

---

\* *Ἐπιστολ.*, p. 135.



Or if Plato's negative conveys a wider meaning, and assumes that the chief builder was above all price, and in no way purchasable, but a choice gift from heaven, such a being is beyond our modern comprehension and experience.

Our object in this discussion is not archæological or classical or antiquarian, but solely practical, and with a view to the future. We are endeavouring to discover what the method was by which the Greeks and 'Goths' achieved their great success in architectural affairs, that thus by contrast we may find the cause of our habitual failure. The Greek 'architect' then was not a workman only, or even a chief workman; he was the master-workman, or chief of the workmen. He was a simple workman in his origin, and probably by family descent, but, advanced to superintendence, he would 'make the plan, arrange the elevations, and be, in fact, the foreman of the work.' However, let us again hear Plato. '*Eleatic Stranger*.—The master-workman does not work himself, but is the ruler of workmen.' 'He contributes knowledge, but not manual labour, and may, therefore, be justly said to share in theoretical science. But he ought not, when he has formed a judgment, to regard his functions as at an end, like the calculator; he must assign to the individual workmen their appropriate task until they have completed the work.'

The architect was, in fact, the foreman of the works. He 'formed a judgment,' that is, he decided on the plan or detail, and thus 'contributed knowledge and theoretical science.' He was 'the ruler of the workmen,' and so *must always have been upon the works*; and 'he assigned to the individual workmen their appropriate task,' and to do this he must himself have been a workman, as any jury of twelve working carpenters and masons would immediately declare. Thus, with the help of another 'chief' or two, Ictinus built the Parthenon. And four master-workmen were engaged on the foundations of the Temple of the Olympian Jove at Athens. If we imagine, then, a dozen architects employed on the foundations of the Law Courts, we shall recognise the difference between the ancient working foreman and the modern 'architect.'

It is further remarkable that we seldom read of a Greek architect who built more than one temple, and never do we find him engaged on more than one building at a time. We never hear of him as a draughtsman, but so frequently are architects called also carvers that many must have been proficient in the plastic art. Theodorus, architect at Samos, was a modeller and carver. Callimachus, the inventor of the Corinthian capital, was of course a carver, and besides he was a goldsmith, an embosser and engraver, a maker of lamps, and, in fact, a very accomplished

accomplished workman. Chotas, an assistant to Phidias, was a carver, and a master-workman of great eminence. Phidias was himself a carver, and his influence is visible in the refinement that distinguishes the Propylæa and the Parthenon. He was not the sub-contractor for the carver's work, but, as the noblest of the workmen, he was made by Pericles the chief superintendent of the works, the architects or master-workmen being under him. Plutarch tells us that 'Phidias directed all, and was the overseer of all for Pericles. And yet the buildings had great architects and artists of the works. For the Parthenon was the work of Callicrates and Ictinus. And almost all things were in his hands, and, as we have said, he superintended all the artists.'

For three centuries there had been a gradual and moderate improvement in the architecture of Greek temples; but under the influence of Phidias this at once rose to perfection, and the absolute refinement of the outlines, curvatures, and mouldings, is the evident result of his more accurate perception, cultivated by his constant study of the human form. Phidias was not regarded as a draughtsman. We have no record of his drawings, but only that he *worked* in marble, ivory, and gold, and this not in a 'study,' as we have somewhere seen, but in a workshop (*ἐργαστήριον*); and, though in artistic and imaginative power he was supreme, he did not fail to use the skill of inferior men. 'In Greece especial excellence in art and handiwork of every kind was greatly prized. The best workman in the most humble craft might succeed in rendering his name immortal. Superior artists were distinguished by the surname godlike; and we are told that the Greeks were accustomed to pray the gods that their memories might never die.'\*

It is abundantly evident, then, that Greek art of all kinds was entirely and exclusively the product and expression of the workman. There is nothing in the slightest degree professional about it, nor have we evidence of any class of draughtsmen who prepared designs. Artists of the highest rank and greatest power lived at their work. Phidias was 'borrowed' by the Eleians to 'make' their statue of Olympian Jove, and Ictinus and Callicrates 'built' the Parthenon. That was their 'work.' The design, exquisite as it is, would have been but a small affair for any draughtsman, and all the special merits of the work are quite beyond the draughtsman's sphere. They are the practical perfection of the improvements gradually made in former temples. The imagination and perception of the workmen had been trained by constant and hereditary use, and their

---

\* Winckelmann.

effect was always manifest in architectural as well as sculptured forms.

Let us now pass from Greece to Rome, and leave philosophers and carvers and the master-workman for an author who is often glorified and quoted as the earliest known advocate and representative of the architectural profession. Vitruvius was for centuries a classic among architects, who made the world believe that he was really an authority of power and weight in architectural affairs, and so the laity have been persistently misled by the fictitious use of this man's worthy name.

'Architecture,' we have been told, 'is a fine art,' and that Vitruvius has said it. Vitruvius has, in fact, said nothing of the kind, but in the first line of his treatise he declares that architecture is a 'science arising out of many other sciences and adorned with much and varied learning.' Architecture is in practice thus transmuted, science takes the place of art, and instead of masters we shall now find only scholars. Vitruvius declares that he 'will lay down rules which may serve as an authority to those who build, as well as to those who are already somewhat acquainted with the science.' And so the good man's 'rules' have 'served as an authority,' and for nothing else. They were, in fact, the law of the profession that was added because of transgression. The inspiration of the workman had been lost, and the regulations of the schoolmaster were the necessary substitute. But wherever work that may be called Vitruvian has been done with demonstration of imaginative power, the good has been in spite of all Vitruvius has ruled, and by an inspiration such as he never had experienced or foreseen. The inspired workman *feels* the necessary, and for ever varying, rules of art. He does not learn them from a treatise, nor accept them as unchangeable and inexpansive.

Vitruvius also in various places shows that among the Greeks the architect personally superintended the work. Ctesiphon, for instance, contrived the apparatus for conveying the shafts of the columns which he had prepared for the Temple of Diana at Ephesus. The man was evidently the master-workman. Pæonius attempted the same method, but was unable to complete his contract.

We have shown from Greek philosophy and Roman story that in building-work the first adviser was the master-workman, that he was the result of selection and culture, that he was a workman though a master, that he had coadjutors if not partners, that they personally superintended the buildings and the individual workmen, and were sometimes, if not always, contractors for the work. This is precisely the state and position of the  
medieval

medieval master-workman. The Greek method and the 'Gothic,' and, in fact, all true building methods, are essentially the same. The subtle curvatures in the lines of a Greek temple and the ornamentation, not casual or fortuitous, of a Gothic church, are the direct expression of the working men of various grades, but always present at the building; so that when building-work was excellent and dignified, there were master-workmen, and now that it is debased, we have no chief of the builders, but only a chief of the clerks, whose aim and occupation is not about art, but only concerning luxury. The modern method is 'like cookery, wholly in the service of pleasure without regarding either the nature or the reason of the pleasure,' but the ancient practice 'has to do with the soul, the processes of art making a provision for the soul's highest interest.'

Nothing can be worse for 'the soul' than a constant appeal to the low instincts and ignorant prejudices of a public greedy for luxuries and display. And yet, after centuries of neglect and of admitted failure, we still continue to despise the workman, and vainly trust in the imposture that would fain 'imitate' his works and thus pretend to take his place. It is the workman only that can effectually perceive and feelingly originate the more subtle elements of good architectural design. Our dilettanti and composers talk of the Greek workman's work as if some special superhuman power had wrought it, and to rival it were hopeless. But if the modern workman could get rid of his desire for all the many curses of our modern 'civilising arts,' and would simply work and make a steady study of his work, he would inevitably rival, and in some respects he might surpass, the glories of the Parthenon itself. But good imaginative work can never come of avarice and greed, nor is there any hope for art in England while the public mind is subject to artistic superstitions. Until we get entirely rid of the fine words that have imposed upon the public, we shall not have sound knowledge and intelligent ideas. '*Fine art*,' for instance, is a term of fashion, and the 'fine' gentlemen who got themselves dubbed 'dilettanti,' 'connoisseurs,' and 'men of taste,' used this 'superior' epithet to scare the uninitiated and exclude 'the vulgar.'

'Art' is another of this class of words. It did mean true imaginative work, but now it means a trade. If art be now our aim and hope, we should abandon all this verbal folly. Art should be known as work, and not as the mere prefigurement of work; we should talk no more of sculptors and professors, architects and artists, but of carvers and master-masons, painters and braziers, carpenters and smiths. Instead of studios and offices

offices we should get back to the prosaic workshop, the *ἐργαστήριον* of Phidias, and the 'bottega' of Michael Angelo; and we should recognise with due respect, and even with affectionate familiarity, such poor implements as the plain workman's bench and stool, the banquer and the forge. We should learn that the imagination of a man is to be used, not for the glorification of another's work, but that he may have pleasure in his own; that his first duty is sound work, and that in this his highest object and chief end should be the culture of the soul that has been given him for his particular development and constant care. When these are all admitted as 'the rights of man,' we may begin to hope; and soon, instead of the fashionable vanities which 'fine art' now produces, we certainly shall see again the genuine workman's work, all good and true, and in its excellence as fine as any relic of the Athenian school, or of the *unrestored* chief mason's work of Lincoln or of Wells.

Vitruvius and the Romans were but dilettanti in their patronage and practice of Greek art. The plain, coarse-minded, practical, and semi-scientific Roman workman, whether bricklayer or mason, was essentially a constructor, and the arch was with him worth all the orders. These he retained just as a fashion, and in using them he treated poor Vitruvius and his 'rules' with scant respect. The workman then concerned himself with his arcades, and domes, and lines and curvatures of plan, and the orders became mere fringes, the artistic sop to gratify the Roman dilettanti.

During the semi-classic period of the earlier Romanesque the workman's more imaginative art was little used. The plans of the basilicas were stereotyped and very simple, and the workmen had the slight amusement of assorting various capitals and columns for the nave and aisles, with some occasional and interesting efforts of design in capitals of sub-'Corinthian' form. But in the 'Lombard' and Byzantine works there is ample evidence of the individual thought and handicraft of the inspired workmen and their chief. The work is practical and thoroughly artistic, the expression of direct thought acting on present material. The workman's mind and hand are seen throughout; his thoughts are manifested as they rise. Changes of detail or of plan are prompt, open, and decided; and at once, without the painful preparation of the schoolman or the office clerk, the utterance is given, and a new line of poetry is in a moment added to the refined beneficent enjoyments of the world.

In looking at the east front of the Louvre, or at the western elevation of St. Paul's, we soon appreciate the harmony of studied  
composition

composition and admire the grace of outline, but no sympathy arises. The design, we know, was drawn by a magnificent composer, who prepared his classical and picturesque effects away in some dull room, but of the men 'that did the work' we never think at all. But when, after a long day's study of the beautiful Duomo that Buschetto built at Pisa, we retire to the shadow of the Baptistry to see the glorious front illumined by the summer's setting sun, no thought arises of the bigness of the church, or of its cost, or even of its architectural effect as an imposing structure, but only of the workmen that so many centuries ago had done the work; we seemingly converse and sympathise directly with the master-workman and with all his men.\* In no single view that we have seen is there so clear and multitudinous a sense of the true working artist's presence; the stones seem cut and fixed in some instinctively harmonious way, each by a separate workman, yet in perfect and spontaneous concert with a general design.

This is the climax of Italian medieval art. The Parthenon at Athens marked the last step of centuries of progress. The building form was perfect, and the ideal forms of gods and heroes were conceived and worked in studious contemplation of supreme humanity. At Pisa we have varied work instead of perfect form, and while we reverence the majesty of Attic art, we sympathise more quickly with the prompt and individual fancy of the homely Lombards. Much of the difference of the two styles was naturally due to the dimensions of the building stone. In Greece the massive blocks of stone and marble would induce severity of outline and colossal forms, but the work of Italy, at all times conscious of the arch, preferred small stones, and so gave greater liberty to all the workmen.

The building-work at Venice has been so well described that it is perfectly familiar even to the untravelled reader; so we pass on to England, where the influence of the individual workman is as clear as at the Pisan Duomo. Thus, 'Benedict, the Abbot of Wearmouth (A.D. 676), crossed the ocean to Gaul, and brought back with him *stone-masons* to make a church after the Roman fashion.' Benedict also 'sent to Gaul to bring over glass-makers, a kind of artificers hitherto unknown in Britain, to close' (*i.e.* with glass) 'the windows of the church. And they came and taught the English nation thenceforth to know and learn an art so well suited to the lanterns of the church and the vessels for various uses.' These master-workmen, then, were themselves the leaders in the arts, and 'taught the English nation.' We are ourselves indebted to these working men; and the Newcastle

---

\* A.D. 1846. The front is now 'restored.'

glassworks may claim direct descent from the few immigrants who twelve hundred years ago were settled by the Wear.

Again, Naitan, king of the Picts, sent to Abbot Ceolfrid, of Jarrow, asking him to send him 'master-workmen ('architectos') who might build among his own people a stone church after the manner of the Romans; and Ceolfrid sent him the master builders whom he required.' Naitan asked not for 'an architect' to build many churches, but for plural 'architectos' to build one church; working foremen, in fact, or 'master-workmen who should assign to the individual workmen their appropriate tasks.'

The same method continues. In the reign of Edgar, the isle of Ramsay, in Huntingdonshire, belonged to a nobleman named Aylwine, 'who was attracted to Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, by the sanctity of his deportment,' and during a long and holy conversation with the Bishop, it came out that Aylwine, having been long ill, was cured by St. Benedict, and received a mission to erect a monastery in the island. Oswald having in his diocese 'twelve brethren in one village who had cast behind their backs the lusts of the flesh, and were only warmed with divine love,' and who would willingly undertake the charge, proposed, like the famous man of business that he was, at once to go with Aylwine and inspect the place. And then explaining to his companion that, 'while erecting there a temporary mansion, we shall also be erecting, if our faith fail not, a mansion eternal in the heavens, Let us (said he) commence at once, lest the devil should take occasion of any delay to breathe a colder spirit upon us. Let me, therefore, send hither a certain man faithful and approved in such works, under whose management a little refectory and dormitory may be prepared.' Ædnothus was sent, who laid out the ground, enlarged the chapel, and added other buildings, according to Oswald's plan. Ædnothus had the care of all the out-door works. He, during the winter, provided the masons' tools of wood and iron, and in the spring he set out the plan of the foundations and dug out the ground. He was, in fact, the chief of the workmen, and he made a fine building of it. The central tower of the church, however, began to crack, and Ædnothus had to report the failure to Aylwine, who agreed to find the money for the restoration. The labourers approached the tower by the roof, and, going stoutly to work, razed it to the very ground, dug out the treacherous earth, made the foundation sure, and again 'rejoiced to see the daily progress of the work.' What a contrast all this is to our present condition and practice! The nobleman 'attracted to the bishop by the sanctity of his deportment;'

‘deportment;’ the memory of the vow after recovery; the ‘twelve brethren in one village who have cast behind their backs the lusts of the flesh;’ the fear of the ‘cold breath of the devil;’ a bishop who could make a plan, and the ‘man faithful in works;’ the cleverness and alacrity of the labourers, and their ‘rejoicing in the progress of their work,’ are such a beatific vision that our retrospective view confirms the holy Oswald’s prescient declaration, ‘Verily, this is another Eden, preordained for men destined for the highest heaven;’ a remark that has not reached our ears respecting the scene of any recent architectural effort.

Such was the system of artistic practice that for six centuries served to make England the finest scene of architectural display that the world ever saw. The workmen worked ‘after their manner;’ they were totally without extraneous artistic tutelage, and the people understood and appreciated the work with no more consciousness or study than would be required for ordinary speech and conversation. The masons were of course largely employed on ecclesiastical buildings; not under the patronage of the clergy, however, but on the contrary rather patronising them, as we find in a very interesting episode of ecclesiastical and architectural history:—

‘In the year of Grace one thousand one hundred and seventy-four, by the just but occult judgment of God, the Church of CHRIST at Canterbury was consumed by fire.’ The monks with due deliberation took good counsel how they might repair the church, but the masons, English and French, whom they consulted, varied in their advice. ‘However, there had come a certain William of Sens, a man active and ready, and, *as a workman, most skilful both in wood and stone.* Him, therefore, the monks retained, on account of his lively genius and good reputation. And to him, and to the providence of God, was the execution of the work committed. And he residing many days with the monks, and carefully surveying the burnt walls in their upper and lower parts, within and without, did yet for some time conceal what he found necessary to be done, lest the truth should kill them in their present state of pusillanimity.

‘But he went on preparing all things that were needful for the work, either of himself or by the agency of others. And when the monks began to be somewhat comforted, he ventured to confess that the pillars rent with the fire, and all that they supported, must be destroyed if the monks wished to have a safe and excellent building. At length they agreed, being convinced by reason, and wishing, above all things, to live in security.

‘And now he addressed himself to the procuring of stone from beyond the sea. He constructed ingenious machines for loading and unloading ships, and for drawing cement and stones. He delivered moulds for shaping the stones to the sculptors who were assembled, and diligently prepared other things of the same kind.’



William of Sens, the master-workman, thus continued the old Athenian method, and 'assigned to the individual workmen their appropriate task.' In the summer of the third year William had a bad fall with the scaffolding, and being 'sorely bruised, gave up the work, and, crossing the sea, returned to his home in France. And another succeeded him in the charge of his works, William by name, English by nation, small in body, but in workmanship of many kinds acute and honest.' We quote two more lines for the sake of the italics:

'Now let us carefully examine what were the works of *our mason* in this seventh year from the fire.

'In this eighth year *the master* erected eight interior pillars.'

Our readers will probably accept the above as conclusive evidence that the master-workman was a fact in English architectural history, and that he is not a 'crotchet.' William of Sens was no compiling copyist. He was a man of thoughtful independent mind, and was one of the earliest to adopt the pointed arch. We hear nothing of his drawings, but only of his moulds for shaping the stones which he himself delivered to the workmen.

Proceeding a step further, to the reign of Henry III., the culminating period of Early Pointed art, we find the famous Bishop, Robert Grosseteste, saying in a letter, that—

'In all kinds of workmanship the master of the work and workmen has the full power, as indeed it is his duty, to investigate and examine, with the utmost diligence, the properties, the different qualities, and the suitability alike of his materials and of the implements necessary for the work; and to make trial of the skill, diligence, and trustworthiness of those that serve under him, so that he may correct whatever is wrong or faulty. *And this he should do, not only through others, but, when it is needful, with his own hand.*'

This 'master of the work and workmen' is the kind of man that built the choir at Westminster.

In Medieval times, when travelling was difficult and 'good society' was rare, the high-placed well-born churchmen would require some gentle pleasant recreation to enjoy in concert with their neighbours and subordinates both clerical and lay. Building just served this purpose, and the amount of noble work that these men left as records of their 'piety' makes it clear that art lost nothing by the absence of the drawing-master and his staff. In course of time a guild or craft arose called the Freemasons, who were especially employed on sacred buildings. These men were families of masons, and the secrets or the technicalities of their craft were, just as in ancient Greece,

Greece, transmitted by inheritance; a true vernacular that never became taught or formed itself into a science, but was a simple living art that constantly advanced. Hope tells us that—

‘Many ecclesiastics of the highest rank, abbots, prelates, and bishops, conferred additional weight on the order of freemasons by becoming its members, themselves superintending the construction of their churches. The masons, when they sought employment, had a chief surveyor who governed the whole troop, and appointed one man as warden over nine others. They built temporary huts round the site of their work, regularly organised their different departments, and sent for fresh supplies of men as they were required.’

Thus the surveyors and the wardens were again the ‘master-workmen who assigned to each workman his appropriate task.’ In 1442 King Henry VI. became a mason, and spared no pains to be a master of the art. The good example of the King was followed very sensibly by many of the nobility, and we subsequently find that the King had perfect aptitude and thorough knowledge of the craft:—

‘About twelve years before his death, the King, being at his palace of Westminster, went into the monastery church, and so forth to St. Edward’s shrine within the same; where he pointed with his staff the length and breadth of his sepulture, and commanded a mason to be called, named Thirske, at that time *master mason* of the chapel of King Henry V., who, by the commandment of the King and in his presence, marked out the length and breadth of the said sepulture with an iron pickis which he had brought with him.’

Thirske, the master mason, was then evidently a working man. A document was then prepared, ‘containing the will and mind of the King in the devising of his sepulture,’ and two messengers being sent to John Essex, head marbeller in ‘Powlys Chirchard,’ he and Thomas Stevyns, coppersmith, of Gutter Lane, went to the King at Westminster, ‘and bargained with him for his tomb to be made, and received of the King in part payment xi<sup>s</sup> in grotes.’ The association for a king was doubtless very low, but, after all, both kings and people in those times did find their common interest and delight in noble works of art and not in vile destruction.

Again, at Winchester, Walkelyn, the Bishop, began to rebuild the cathedral in A.D. 1079, and he built most nobly. His transcripts are for impressiveness quite unsurpassed, but his name is little known in comparison with that of William of Wykeham, who was Bishop some three centuries later, and who is held to be the architectural hero of the Winton church. He was a man of business, clerk of the King’s works, clever at accounts, princely  
in

in his munificence, and a friend of learning, great in his designs, but an abominable builder. The work at Winchester that he directed is but a desperate collapse of art. He touched nothing that he did not deface. The west front is, for its size, the poorest in the kingdom. The interior of the nave is a distinguished specimen of that mechanical and costly commonplace which quickly charms the vulgar. If our readers will compare this fashionable work with the grand and simple 'Norman' transepts, or with the noble nave of Romsey Abbey, they will begin perhaps to question whether New College is a sufficient expiation for such wholesale and irreparable vandalism. Wykeham, however, was not the 'architect' who designed the work, as is so generally supposed, nor yet, of course, the master mason. He was probably the intelligent, and unpoetical, and inartistic 'operarius' or chief director of the King's masons, 'whose special duty it was to make arrangements with the master of the works.'

In art there is no patronage or servitude. The interest and delight are common to the king, the public, and the handicraftsman. Like poetry and science, art must be free, and in its own sphere supreme, or otherwise its spirit fades, and energy and life are lost. Rank, royalty, and riches may become the deferential sympathising friends of art, but not its patrons or its fashionable guides. So when the evil influence of which Wykeham was the early representative became paramount, and ostentation was promoted above excellence, art retired, and the masons soon adopted the mechanical and hasty method of design now called the Perpendicular and Tudor styles. In these there is abundance of idea and of able workmanship, but the ideas are superficial, and the work, though neat and scientific, has neither individuality nor true poetic feeling. All that the courtiers and the men of trade required was prompt achievement and vainglorious display, regardless of the dignity or degradation of the workmen. Dudley and Empson, and their royal master, are the moral illustrations of the Tudor style.

But we need not limit our inquiry to England. Let us now cross the sea to Spain, and learn what Mr. Street can tell us about medieval architects. In chapter xxi. of his interesting work on 'Gothic Architecture in Spain,' he says, 'Almost all the architects or masters of the works referred to in all the books I have examined seem to have been laymen, and just as much a distinct class as architects are at the present day.' This is, unfortunately, their only similarity; they are 'distinct,' but in a totally opposite way. Raymond of Montforte, for instance, when employed by the Chapter of Lugo, A.D. 1129, 'was retained solely for the work there.' His salary was annual; his engage-  
ment

ment was for life. He is called in the contract not 'architect, but 'master of the works'—

'The title which, in course of time, was usually given to the architect; though I am not inclined to think that it makes it impossible that he should also have worked with his own hands. Indeed, the very next notice of an architect is of one who certainly did act as sculptor on his own works. This was Mattheus, master of the works at Santiago Cathedral. Ferdinand II., A.D. 1168, granted him a pension of a hundred maravedis annually for the rest of his life; and the fact proves, I think, the King's sense of the value of a fine church, and also somewhat as to the degree of importance which its designer may have attained to when he was recognised at all by the King. There can be no doubt that he had been acting there both as sculptor and architect; and if *from a modern point of view he lost caste as an architect, he, no doubt, gained it as an artist.* Here, as at Lugo, the master of the works was appointed at a salary for his lifetime, and held his office precisely in the same way as do the surveyors of our own cathedrals at the present day.'

Mr. Street gets very much misled by his nomenclature. The King gave the pension not to the 'designer,' but to the carver of the doorways. He would certainly have been perplexed if some draughtsman had been presented to him as the 'designer' of the work. The carver was, of course, the designer; and Matthew wrote his name upon the lintels because he 'did the work.' Ferdinand appreciated well the relative importance of himself and Matthew, and he paid a proper tribute to the mason's great superiority. He saw that Heaven itself had recognised the 'Master' and that the workman who conceived and wrought the 'Glory' of St. James was a creator, and in mental rank, in permanence of power and influence, and in nobility of work, above the patronising recognition of a king. We do not hear that Phidias 'attained to importance' when 'he was recognised' by Pericles. Titian is said to have been 'recognised' by Charles V. in a becoming way.

'In A.D. 1175, Raymundo, a "Lombardo," contracted 'to complete in seven years certain works in the Cathedral at Urgel, and was to be paid by a canon's portion for the rest of his life. The mode of payment, the engagement for life, and the absence of any reference to a master of works, lead, I think, to the conclusion that he was, in truth, the architect, *but*'—this 'but' is very amusing—'*but that he also superintended the execution of the works, and contracted for the labour.*'

'In A.D. 1203, one Pedro de Cumba is "Magister et fabricator," and there can be no doubt, therefore, that *he not only designed but executed the work*, which, as we go on, we shall find to have been a *not very uncommon custom.*' (O sancta simplicitas!)

Jacobo

Jacobo de l'avariis, one of the architects employed at the rebuilding of the Cathedral of Gerona, 'was appointed in A.D. 1320-22, at a salary of two hundred and fifty sueldos a quarter, and under an agreement to come from Narbonne six times a year. Here we seem to have a distinct recognition of a class of men who were not workmen, but really and only superintendents of buildings—in fact, architects in the modern sense of the word.'

The word architect, then, has an ancient sense to contrast with its modern meaning, and, with Mr. Street's assistance we shall find that the old architects were persons of entirely different character and functions from their modern namesakes.

'About the same time Jayme Fabre appears to have been one of the greatest architects of his day. It is impossible to read the account of the completion of the shrine of Sta. Eulalia at Barcelona without feeling that Fabre superintended a number of masons, and acted, in fact, as their foreman; though this is no reason why he should not *also have designed the work they executed.*'

'In the same year, at San Felice, Gerona, Pedro Zacoma, master of the works of the steeple, was *not to undertake any other works* without permission. He was to be paid by the day, with a yearly salary in addition. He must have been employed constantly at the church, and in such a building a man could hardly have been constantly employed without *absolutely working as a mason.*'

This is conclusive. We have seen that the old 'architect' and master-builder was a workman, that he designed the work, that he personally superintended it, and that he was constantly employed upon it; and now Mr. Street adds that this could hardly have been the case without his actually working as a mason.

In A.D. 1416, Guillermo Boffiy, master of the works of the Cathedral at Gerona, proposed to build a single nave of the same width as the choir and its aisles. The Chapter very prudently sought the advice of practical and able men on this bold daring project, and a dozen architects were asked for their opinions upon oath. Of these—

'All but two called themselves "Lapididæ." One was "Magister sive sculptor imaginum;" and two only call themselves masters of the works. Their answers seem to prove that they were all men of considerable intelligence.

'There cannot be a shadow of doubt that at the beginning of the fifteenth century *most of the superintendents of buildings*, in Cataluña at any rate, *were sculptors or masons also.* Their own description of themselves is conclusive on this point; at the same time their answers are all given in the tone and style of architects; and it is quite certain that had there been a superior class of men—architects only  
in

in the modern sense of the word—the Dean and Chapter would have applied first of all to them.’

And thus we see why ‘architecture in the modern sense’ is ‘certainly superior’ to the medieval work of which it is, as our Historian announces, but a ‘Copying or Imitative Style.’ Mr. Street’s notions of superiority and his opinions about medieval Deans and Chapters appear hardly to be justified by architectural evidence; but on the other hand his testimony is so frank and candid, so valuable and copious, that there is some difficulty in knowing how to select and when to make an end. We venture one or two quotations more :—

‘In A.D. 1518, Domingo Urteaga contracted for the erection of a church at Cocentaina in Valencia. *He bound himself to go with his wife and family to Cocentaina.* He was to be every day at the work, having half an hour for breakfast and an hour for dinner in winter, and an hour and a half in summer.’ •

Clearly arrangements for a working man, and—

‘Though Urteaga *was evidently only a foreman of the works*, there is no reference to any superintendent or architect, and nothing is said about any plans which are to be followed. I conclude, therefore, that in this case *the foreman of works was really the architect.* Urteaga was to do all that a “master” ought in the management of such a work, and was to receive each day for himself five sueldos, and was to provide two assistants and two apprentices, the former to have three sueldos each, and the latter one and a half.’

Of Guillermo Sagrera, who was both builder and architect of the Exchange at Palma, Mr. Street remarks that :—

‘*He presented the plans himself*, and that there is no trace whatever of any architect or superintendent over him. It is doubted by some whether this mixture of the two offices of builder and architect was ever allowed in the middle ages, but Sagrera’s agreement is conclusive as regards this particular case, and we may be tolerably sure that *such a practice must have been a usual one*, or it would hardly have been adopted in the case of so important a building.’

‘The result that we arrive at after this *résumé* of the practice of Spanish architects is certainly that *it was utterly unlike the practice of our own day.*’

After this long excursion—and thanks to Mr. Street for his instructive guidance—let us return to England. In his valuable contribution to ‘Gleanings from Westminster Abbey,’ Mr. J. H. Parker says :

‘This point of the necessity of a gang of skilled workmen accustomed to work together for the production of the great works of mediæval art has not been sufficiently attended to. The fables of the  
Freemasons

Freemasons have produced a natural reaction, and the degree of truth which there is in their traditions has consequently been overlooked. We know that each of our great cathedrals had a gang of workmen attached to it in regular pay, almost as a part of the foundation, for the fabric fund could not be lawfully devoted to any other purpose; and these workmen became by long practice very skilful, more especially the masons or workers in, and the carvers of, free-stone, as distinct from the labourers, who merely laid the rubble-work for the foundations and rough part of the fabric. From various indications it would seem that there was a royal gang of workmen in the King's pay by whom the great works ordered, and perhaps designed by the *King himself (such being the complete diffusion of architectural taste and knowledge)*, were constructed. The wills of Henry VI. and Henry VII. seem to show that these monarchs were at least, to some extent, architects themselves; they give the most minute directions for the works to be done just as any architect might have done. St. George's, King's College, and Henry the Seventh's Chapel, were all probably built by the royal gang of masons.'

With this we close our English evidence from medieval work and records. We have continuous proof that in the west of Europe and throughout the middle ages the master-workman was the designer of the buildings. Even so late as the seventeenth century, when the Renaissance was developed nearly to the full, we find that Wadham College Chapel was designed and built by a small gang of working masons brought from Somersetshire. But in Italy, three hundred years before, a draughtsman was employed to make a fine design for foolish work, and then the decadence of architecture had begun. Giotto, the most inspired as well as most extensive painter of his age, was a wall decorator, a master-workman, full of fancy, and with visions of human sentiment and beauty constantly before him. These he soaked into the wet plaster, and as fresco pictures they remain his nobler kind of workmanship. But in a conventional and decorative painter's way he also imitated wooden panelling and marbles and mosaic-work, and when the Florentines, smitten with vanity and pride of purse, resolved to make a tower, not simply as a thing of beauty, but 'to exceed in magnificence, height, and excellence of workmanship, whatever of the kind had been achieved by Greeks and Romans,' Giotto was engaged as the '*Capo Maestro*,' at a *yearly salary* of one hundred florins in gold, and *he was not to leave Florence*. His order and his business aim were, not to make a work of art, but studiously to satisfy a vain ambition. But the Athenians, when they built the Parthenon, never dreamed that any good could be attained by rivalling the Rameseum and the Pyramids in magnificence and height. They sought to exceed, not others, but themselves: 'and,

‘and, as the works arose inimitable in form and grace, the makers vied to excel the handiwork itself by the beauty of their art.’

Giotto then made a superficial false design after the manner of a wall decorator, and not of a chief builder or a master mason; preparing carefully a model of the tower and marking in the joints and colour of the marble work. The panelling and mosaic-work are an elaborate and costly copy of the cheap facile painter’s work, itself an imitation, that Giotto used to cover his inferior wall surfaces and enframe his fresco pictures. It is ‘exquisite,’ but it is not architecture. It is, in fact, an early exhibition of the ‘Imitative Style.’ The enrichment which should be a developed grace and an occasional efflorescence on a huge building like this tower, is, in fact, a complete casing, and reveals, sufficiently for Giotto’s credit, though to Florentine disgrace, that the tower was built as it was ordered for the sake of the decoration, instead of decoration being used with modest reticence to glorify the tower. The masonry is but a scaffolding or core. The panelling is made like joiner’s work, and, as is right in panelling, but very wrong in towers, suggests extension and tenuity and lightness of material with corresponding sacrifice of solid power and stability. This, with the tall proportions of the panels, gives a frail and insecure effect to the whole surface. The marble-work appears to have no adequate support, but to be in danger, from the slightest settlement, of flaking off. The small mosaic-work upon the window-jambs and other parts is but a record of much futile drudgery. The tracery in the topmost windows and the tall twisted columns are both bad and frivolous, and the large high projecting parapet and cornice are entirely disproportioned to the light feeble-looking work on which they are constructed. The general effect is ‘elegant’ and delicate, but for the dignity and power that a building of this height and size should manifest, Giotto’s tower is far below the work of our old masons, or of the Lombard architects. The tower was a genuine conception of the committee mind, and Giotto was engaged to decorate the folly. Like Phidias, as the greatest of the workmen, he ‘directed all, and was overseer of all; and yet the building had great artists of the works;’ for the carving of the lower story was the work of Andrea Pisano, Luca della Robbia, and Donatello; ‘and almost all things were in his hands, and he superintended all the artists.’ These carvers, like their predecessors at the Parthenon, worked each to please and to express himself, and so the tower has been saved from absolute debasement. But when Giotto died, the work went on ‘professionally,’ as a copy and  
without



without artistic growth, a thorough 'modern' work; and the result is an extravagant and useless feat of uninspired labour, hard and mechanical, without life or art relationship, or any influence in architectural development and history. Mute, inexpressive, isolated, it is but a tall toy, most beautiful among its peers, but in true architectural worth as much inferior to the rough manliness of the old palace of the Signoria, or to the delicate variety of the small Spina chapel, as it is beyond these buildings in mere altitude and in proportionate expense.

But Giotto was a real 'master-workman,' and himself assisted in the 'sculptured' decoration of the tower. His panelled work is very much superior to that on the cathedral, which is as bad and mean as the interior of the church is ugly. The interiors of the churches and cathedrals after the Lombard period are for the most part miserably poor, both in conception and detail. The Duomo and the church of Santa Croce show the degradation of the master mason, and the carved capitals of the nave piers in the 'Gothic' churches are so bad as to suggest some recondite and undiscovered meaning for their special ugliness.

The Greeks used marble as a means for their refined and delicate display of form and outline. The masons at St. Mark's employed it in a sound workman's way, subordinate to the architectural character of the basilica; and there the work commands respect and admiration by reason of its genuine simplicity of method and of aim. But at Florence, surface marble-work, from the mean parti-coloured panelling of the Duomo, to the lavish expenditure on the chapel of the Medici, is a pure luxury without disguise. In using marble decoration singleness of purpose is the universal absolute necessity, and the single purpose that takes precedence of all in works of art is the social and refined enjoyment of the workman. The Greek carver and the master builder never thought about the costliness of the Pentelic stone, but only of its absolute susceptibility of all gradations of expression and of form. The Byzantine workman gloried in coloured marbles, and rejoiced that he could make his building seem to harmonise with and reflect the splendours of his Eastern sea and sky. While he recognised the dignity of the material, there was in him no thought of costliness for its own sake, or of the 'imposing character' of rare and polished stone. He had no idea of making all his work subordinate to any ecclesiastical pretension, and at St. Mark's he used his monolithic marble shafts, his brightest colours, and his choicest pictures of mosaic-work and gold, not only for the glory of the hierarchy and their upper seats, but also in the front, the portals, and most public portions of the church, to dignify and please the world. And thus his  
workman's

workman's inspiration has become a permanent ennobling charm for all men.

Most people suffer somewhat from magnificence upon the brain, and hence the safety of society is greatly due to the incompetence of men to carry out their vast designs. The Florentines were sadly subject to this overleaping impulse; and in consequence their buildings seldom reached completion. But for the Duomo they resolved 'to raise the loftiest, most sumptuous, and most magnificent pile that human invention could devise or human labour execute.' The result of all this 'sumptuous' determination is Arnolfo's miserable nave, in which it seems Giotto had some hand, and as a suitable climacteric the dismal cupola that, four generations later, Brunelleschi raised. And so throughout the Renaissance we find that in architecture sumptuousness and engineering, domes and marbles, entirely superseded noble work. Italian mediæval architecture was in fact ruined by costly marble-work. Stone and the inspired mason were neglected, and costliness and polished smoothness were esteemed the elements of art. In carving, however, and in tombs and monuments, the workman still for centuries maintained his masterful condition.

We know that Michael Angelo declared and signed himself a 'carver,' but at clerical suggestion he sometimes, like Giotto, left his special work and aptitude to make designs for buildings. The Farnese Palace has no doubt a handsome 'elevation,' that is to say, it is agreeable to look at for a moment, and then to be well rid of. Who can help pitying the owner of that dismal cube of stone-work when he daily came in sight of it and saw it was his home? The general design is worth some admiration upon paper. The architect who completed the exterior had consummate knowledge of the influence of proportion, boundless wealth to work with, and the Colosseum for a quarry. Moreover *he was present at the work*, and so careful of the details that he had them formed in wood full size, and tested on the building. Michael Angelo was not an 'architect only.' Still the palace is but a majestic misery, cheerless as a prison, and incapable of human sympathy or popular delight; the stones are evidently dead, they had no inspiration from the workmen.

Michael Angelo, much against his will, was compelled to decorate the Sistine chapel ceiling. The idea of such decoration is of course absurd. Giotto, the working plaster painter, knew much better than to perpetrate such waste, and at the Arena chapel he made the ceiling a plain azure blue, that served by contrast to increase the effect of colour in his paintings on the walls.

walls. Michael Angelo's commission was not given from any love of art, but as a means of personal distinction and of hierarchical display. Julius had no wish to 'patronise the arts,' but only to make use of them to glorify himself, and he impressed poor Michael Angelo just as he might enlist a leader of trained bands. This was the true spirit of the Revival. Art was to be no longer an unobtrusive quiet ordinary work, but must be treated as a slavish luxury, and be compelled to illustrate the wayward whimsies of the Papal churchmen. But Michael Angelo actually *worked* at the Sistine chapel ceiling not merely furnishing the plan and drawings, but himself 'fresh-painting' all the plaster. He was the inspired workman; but as he was a carver and not a practised decorator, he designed the ceiling in a technically unskilful way. He could draw and mould the human form with masterly precision, but when he ventured into architectural details, he, pardonably, missed the true artist method, and so his pictures on the ceiling are surrounded by a barbarous medley of Renaissance forms, a half-pretence of solid architecture, absurd in principle, and clumsy in effect.

How the medieval and the ancient decorative painters could conventionalise the forms of building-work, and subordinate them to the requirements of art, is shown in Giotto's pictures and the Pompeian frescoes, but the 'architectural' painting on the Loggie ceilings in the Vatican shows how little Raphael had discovered of the sense and scope of decorative art.

Both Michael Angelo and Raphael were in some things servants to the fashion of the day. Their buildings were designed, as of necessity when power of wealth and power of mind were ample, with much dignity and grace; but in the details their unworkmanlike contrivances proclaim the whole to be a fiction, a mere 'Imitative Art.' To Michael Angelo the 'Renaissance' Italian style was a dead language, and to his workmen it was but an unknown tongue. The Master and his men were equally unable to express themselves artistically in such a fabricated dialect; and from St. Peter's to the latest building of 'New Rome,' Italian architecture is but a dreary evidence of luxury, a record of expenditure and folly. True, there is art in Italy, and of the best; but, Italy is still the great 'World's Show' of architectural rubbish, and this rubbish is exactly what our travelled people most extol and feebly seek to imitate.

In Germany some sixty years ago an ancient vellum drawing of Cologne Cathedral was discovered. This was, perhaps, the original design, or a contemporary copy, and its elaboration and completeness well account for the demerits of the building. It is a student's effort, the result of knowledge and selection; and

and its evident intention was to make a church supreme in size, and height, and symmetry of form. All this has been attained, but in human sympathy and true poetic art the building is a failure. It is, perhaps, the largest church of Gothic commonplace that ever was constructed, and for artistic worth is not for a moment comparable with the Abbey Church at Westminster, St. Stephen's at Vienna, or a hundred still existing abbeys and cathedrals. The design was made when Amiens, Rouen, Rheims, and Notre Dame Cathedrals were still new. These were all built by masons who made drawings quite subservient to their work of art; but at Cologne the draughtsman spirit ruled, and so the masons used their common knack without a thought of poetry or touch of life. Cologne Minster is, in fact, a previous example of what Mr. Fergusson has called the 'Imitative Styles.' On the projected spires the details are extravagant in size, the crowning finials are much larger than the open archway of the Minster doors. This is not mason's work or architecture, but a clear evidence of draughtsmanship and of imaginative incapacity.

On the resumption of the Minster works there was a festal gathering, and there, most prominently placed, was every workman then employed upon the church, from the chief-master to the quarryman's apprentice. 'And, turning to the artisans, the Dom-Baumeister bade them prove their skill, concluding a manly, honest address with the sentiment of Schiller's "Song of the Bell":—

"Let praise be to the workman given,  
But the blessing comes from Heaven."

With us the drawing-master, not 'the workman,' gets 'the praise;' and so, it seems, 'the blessing' does *not* come.

The public hear Cologne Cathedral called the culminating effort and display of medieval art; and, knowing and mistrusting their own ignorance, they accept the dicta of the connoisseurs, and strenuously endeavour to be pleased. Of course they fail, and, finding nothing lovely or of interest, they leave the church in blank amazement at its height and bigness, and perplexed at what they modestly assume to be their own deficiency in architectural discernment. The work is a gigantic folly, and a total waste unless it proves a warning.

Let us contrast our own old English building method which but sixty years ago was not extinct. About that time the exterior of Henry VII.'s chapel was restored, and there we find the master mason still a power:—

"There was but very little occasion for the interference of the  
architect;

architect; all the labour of arranging the work, tracing out the details and ornaments, and supplying the defects from corresponding parts, being left to the discretion and industry of the mason. The task was an important one; and required professional skill, a practised eye, and sound judgment. It is no eulogium to say that the execution of this work could not have been entrusted to a more careful artisan than Mr. Gayfere.'

This was Thomas Gayfere, mason of the Abbey. The Abbey then, was built by masons, its noble tombs were made and were designed by working men, and the most lavish work was capably restored by a discreet industrious mason.

The habitual notion of the middle and superior classes that the workmen are inferior in natural ability, or in the higher qualities of lively genius and imaginative mind, is very English. In fact, these men are frequently above 'their betters' in power of mental application and endurance. The man that makes a table or a chair requires more nervous energy than the glib shopman offering it for sale. A banquer mason or a leading joiner is, 'by profession,' greatly more accomplished than a small tradesman or a banker's clerk. The workman's only want is to regain his old and natural position, and secure the opportunity to make his capabilities and acquirements felt and known. Where this is given, even to a mill-hand, or machinist, or a manufacturing engineer, his mental power becomes magnificent. Of the seven hundred patents for our hosiery and lace machines, every inventor except two has been recorded as a *working* handicraftsman. Or if we rise above mechanics, and proceed from manufacturing England to the land of poetry and song, these arts are the acknowledged birthright of the people; not only of a Dante, a Manzoni, a Palestrina, or a Mario, but of the vinedressers of Bronte, and the peasantry of Veggiano; of the plaintive cantatore of the Bay of Naples, and of the wandering herdsman on the Tuscan Apennines.

Remaining still in Italy, and studying Baron Hübner's general view of Rome three hundred years ago, we find that when Pope Sixtus, the last man of great commanding power on the Papal throne, proposed to build, he did not choose an 'architect' or draughtsman, but engaged a young Comascho mason as his master builder. 'He and the young Fontana together formed plans, discussed and settled them.' When it had been proposed to raise the obelisk of Nero in the centre of the piazza of St. Peter, 'Michael Angelo and San Gallo, who were the first architects of the day, were unanimous in declaring the undertaking to be impracticable. Their opinion being law,' the  
idea

idea was given up. Fontana afterwards designed a plan which was accepted; but, as the mason was still young, two 'architects of eminence' were ordered by the Commission to carry out the work. Fontana then, appealing to the Pope, declared '*that no man can better carry out a plan than the man who has conceived it, for no one can perfectly master the thoughts of another.*' Struck by the justice of this remark, Sixtus intrusted the whole business to his former mason. Not only Rome, but the whole of Europe, watched the works with anxious curiosity, and on September 10, 1586, the obelisk was erected on its pedestal with perfect success.

Going with Mr. Fergusson still further south, to work entirely recent, we discover in the 'parish church of Moustà, in the island of Malta, a remarkable instance of a building erected in the same manner, and according to the exact principles which covered Europe with beautiful edifices during the middle ages.'

'The real architect of the building was the village mason, Angelo Gatt. Like a master mason in the middle ages, or those men who build the most exquisite tombs or temples in India at the present day, he can neither read nor write nor draw; but, following his own constructive instincts and the dictates of common sense, he has successfully carried out every part of this building. It was he who insisted on erecting the dome without scaffolding, and showed how it could be done by simply notching each course on to the one below it. With true mediæval enthusiasm, he was content to devote his whole time to the erection of this great edifice, receiving only fifteen pence a day for twenty years.'

The area of this master mason's self-supporting dome is one-third larger than that of our architectural wonder at St. Paul's, and the height is greater than that of the Pantheon at Rome. The total cost was one-and-twenty thousand pounds, 'besides the gratuitous labour of the villagers and others, estimated at half that amount.'

George Kemp, the architect of the Scott monument at Edinburgh, was but a village carpenter, and so was much objected to by his superiors, who desired that some 'professional' of eminence should be employed, and not a common man of great ability, whose work and powers were much above their mental range.

The late Augustus Welby Pugin was a noted 'architect,' and able as a draughtsman, and so to some might seem to be an illustration adverse to our theory. But Pugin was much more than a draughtsman:—

'The most careful discipline and training after academic methods will fail in making an artist, unless he himself take an active part in

the work. Like every highly cultivated man, he must be self-educated. When Pugin, who was brought up in his father's office, had learnt all that he could of architecture, according to the usual formulas, he still found that he had learnt but little, and that he must begin at the beginning and *pass through the discipline of labour*. He hired himself out as a common carpenter at Covent Garden Theatre, and thus acquired a familiarity with work.'—Smiles, *Self-Help*.

Pugin was apparently an artist spoilt. Had he discarded 'instruments' and kept to tools, he might have reached his natural position, and become a famous master-workman. His architectural and decorative works all show exceptional ability in their inferior way; but none are really good. His church at Ramsgate, where he was, in fact, the master, is by far the best, and is his worthiest monument. Who can tell how different his fate might possibly have been, had he secured the quiet soothing influence of true artist life, instead of suffering the vexation and excitement of a mock profession?

We may now quote the latest instance of true building master-workmanship. The Portcullis Club, 93, Regent Street, Westminster, 'is a working-man's club in the strictest sense of the word. *The ground upon which it stands has been purchased.* The materials of which it is built have been paid for, and the labour has been found by the working men themselves, many of them working until twelve o'clock at night. Not only so; they have been their own architects. The whole of the plans and elevations have been beautifully drawn by one of the members;' and thus the little front is much more satisfactory and respectable than the Charing Cross Hotel or the Royal Academy façade.

These are examples of mere accidental gleams of truth in modern practice, and they show that the return to sanity in art is by a very short and easy way. And now, continuing the method of historical comparison, that discovers art to be in every age the exclusive trust and treasure of the workman, let us go back four thousand years to the Egyptian tombs, and hear 'the dead lift up his voice to tell us of his life.' Ameni, a great functionary, has inscribed upon his tomb the record of his own administration, and therein reveals the generous influence of the master-workman in a wider sphere. 'All the lands under me were ploughed and sown from north to south. Thanks were given to me on behalf of the royal house for the fat cattle which I collected. Nothing was ever stolen out of my workshops. *I worked myself, and kept the whole province at work.* Famine never occurred in my time, nor did I let any one hunger in years of short produce; never did I disturb the fisherman or molest the

the shepherd. Never was a child afflicted, never a widow ill-treated by me; and I have not preferred the great to the small in the judgments I have given.' And on the wall are durably depicted illustrations of Ameni's works: *the building and lading of large ships*, the fashioning of furniture from costly woods, the preparation of garments, and the various scenes of husbandry and handicraft. Of the comparative value and intelligence of the Egyptian workmen, the three great Memphian Pyramids, the oldest monuments extant of building art, give curious and simple evidence. 'The slope of the entrance-passages is just the angle of rest for such material as the stone of the Pyramids, and, therefore, the proper inclination for the sarcophagus to be easily moved without letting it descend of itself.' Our readers, possibly, may recollect 'the launch' of the 'Great Eastern,' and 'the angle of rest' and immobility that our engineer of eminence 'designed.' Had common workmen used their own responsible intelligence about the work, the recent 'builders of large ships' upon the foreshore of the Thames might not have proved inferior to the primeval working engineers and architects who built the wondrous mausoleums in the valley of the Nile.

The failure and the remedy have been at length discovered. At the recent distribution of prizes at the Engineering College, Cooper's Hill, Lord Salisbury, in the true spirit of the Operarius or Master Workman, advised the students 'not to be afraid, but to cultivate a knowledge of the smaller, and what he might call the more repulsive (?), details of their profession. He was very glad to see that the attendance in the workshops was spoken of in the very highest terms by the examiners. There has been hitherto no lack of the most distinguished theoretical knowledge, but the deficiencies have been in those small practical matters on which the success of the work often depends.'

Our history of the Master-Workman is complete. His method and position have been traced throughout the course of European culture. To him we are indebted for the glories of the Athenian Acropolis, the splendour of the Venetian Basilica, the dignity of the Lombard Duomo, and the infinite variety and charm of medieval building-work. The old method still survives in Oriental manufacture, and here again we find the modern workman painfully surpassed by his more 'educated' Indian rival. In the International Exhibition at South Kensington,—

'It was humiliating to our national pride to perceive in the specimens of Indian art workmanship a grace and finish to which we cannot attain in spite of all our modern discoveries and appliances of mechanism daily becoming more delicate in their operation. The Indian worker in gold or silver produces the most elaborate and



beautiful objects with the rudest tools, and *as long as we leave him to himself his models are purely artistic, but as soon as he attempts to produce European articles from our designs the individuality of the artist is lost, and his work is vulgarised.*—*Companion to the British Almanack, 1872.*

Those who last year visited the World's Show at Vienna will admit the general truth of these remarks. The Japanese display of art made ours look pitiful. In Japan the true style and method of art decoration are maintained. The porcelain and the painting are, in artistic combination, but one work. In our Bond Street china the fine paintings on the plates and vases are mere pictures quite distinct from pottery, and only gain some prettiness and polish from the soft glaze and texture of the ware; but they are no more to be styled ceramic art than any portrait on a panel or on copper can be classed with the achievements of the joiner or the smith. It is painful to see that in Japan, as in India, the attempt to produce articles for the European taste and market is already corrupting the workman. At Vienna in the Oriental courts there were sad evidences of the debasing influence of 'Western culture.'

Much wonderment and admiration have been frequently expressed at what we in a patronising way are pleased to call the almost Occidental cleverness of our new friends the Japanese. The cause of their ability is obvious. The people of Japan for many hundred years 'have placed the handicraftsman, down to the humblest, above the merchant and the trader in the social scale;' they have steadily maintained the artistic and imaginative training of their workmen, and as a consequence, or a concurrent influence and result, the entire population has retained its natural intelligence, and is apt to think, quick in fancy and imagination, and therefore prompt to adopt and to improve; and last year their workmen made the most refined display of decorative workmanship that Europe ever saw. The life and work of Luca della Robbia, or of Palissy, show that Japan has no exclusive artist power. 'The metal jugs of all sizes which abound on the Continent are models of undesigned art. Equally good, though a little less simple, is the rough blue and white stone ware of the South of France.' But we in England make the able potter a neglected underling of some great manufacturing firm, whose customers and show-rooms are a hundred miles away. With such a system no designs by Flaxman will make 'works of art,' nor raise our pottery above mere toy-work and a trade.

Perhaps it may be said that to employ an ordinary workman would imply the loss of all the luxury, the elegance, and the refinement of our modern civilising arts. This is the current talk,

talk, and really merits a reply like Hotspur's to the popinjay. Of course the trash that fills the Bond Street shops would disappear, and houses, churches, dress, and furniture would all be changed from foppish finery to dignified imaginative art. The 'charming' luxuries that the fashionable world demands have almost always been the work and the contrivance of the common artisan. The tradesman only sells the goods, the workman finds the brains.

The remedy is obvious, and involves no suffering or abnegation. The public, of whatever sort or grade, should, like the medieval aristocracy and kings, aspire to cultivate the social and artistic friendship of the master-workman. This is already done in other arts, and barber surgeons, and the quacks of former days, have given place to those who 'do the work' of healing. In some respects, however, the condition and the progress of the world have been most curiously inverted since the middle ages. In those times the public mind was greatly conversant with building art, and being free and bright in thought, the natural result was excellence in work; but in theology it was comparatively dark, and subject to the superstition of the Papacy. Now, on the contrary, the English mind asserts its liberty in theological affairs, but in respect of art it is benighted. The present period of artistic imbecility would merit the contempt of those great working men who lived in ages that the vulgar have assumed to be uncivilized and 'dark.'

Our working men have no respect or sympathy for those who call themselves their 'chiefs;' and as a serious direct result of want of interest in their work, we find that workmen do considerably less per hour, in quantity and quality, than they accomplished thirty years ago. An independent 'master,' with associated workmen, would do much more and better work than a commercial builder, dealing with hirelings, and habitually subject to trade jealousies and strikes. The saving to society would be immense. The money that is wasted on our buildings, public and private, would suffice to lodge us all like princes. 'During the past year the directors of the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company Limited have been erecting some dwellings by the employment of their own workpeople, under a competent foreman, and thus far the experiment has worked satisfactorily. Greater care and attention being bestowed upon the details of the work, the expenses of repairs will, it is believed, be much less in these buildings. Thirty dwellings at Bethnal Green estate have been nearly completed upon this plan, and the Company's workpeople are now proceeding with sixty more.' Lord Shaftesbury and some other gentlemen have, in a way of business, helped to  
build

build a little town of houses near the Wandsworth Road. 'The architect has been a working foreman, and, to a great extent, the builders are the occupiers of the houses. Men of each trade were "pressed for their ideas," and the result has shown the amount of practical ingenuity that can be brought by an intelligent community of working men into a work on which their hearts are set.' Each man, however, should possess and care for his own freehold. The occasional correspondence in the daily papers makes us see that in their architectural affairs our sapient Englishmen are 'mostly fools,' and this particularly in their consent to live in leasehold houses. Art never can exist on such a tenure. We could distinctly show its bad effect, not on architecture only, but on the sister arts of sculpture, metal work, and painting; each has sunk, is sinking, and will sink, unless the firm and stable freehold tenure is restored. No one can think of any of our fine old buildings, sacred or secular, as leaseholds, nor will substantial fireproof houses be constructed upon leasehold ground; and when the public understand that individual benefit and the general good are equally involved in freehold tenure, all proprietors will join in a demand for such legislation, essentially conservative, as would allow, and, if required, compel urban enfranchisement. The project has its precedents; and tithe commutation, copyhold enfranchisement, and canal and railway Acts, have made the public and the lawyers understand that the proprietors of land encumbrances, and ground rents, may be forced to sell, and yet be very willing vendors.

Thus we have sought to teach the student how to recognise the only 'path that leads to excellence in art,' to explain the reason why the old building-work, so often glorious, is always good; and why our modern work, though clever and correct in imitation or design, is everywhere, and must be, radically bad; and so to prove and illustrate the doctrine of the workman's mastery.

Our plea is naturally made with special reference to the interest of the Church in human progress; and, most obviously, in 'all that influences the building art. This seems to justify 'a strong deliverance;' and is our great encouragement to speak aloud. And so, by much of friendly frankness, we have hoped to arouse the attention of the clergy, and to lead them to perceive how greatly the advancement of the intellectual and moral state of man, and the true dignity and influence of the Church, must be affected by the full development of the artistic 'lively genius of the workman.' As this appeal is not perfunctory but earnest, it may

may be made with little reticence, and yet with much respect for those whose audience and help are claimed. This freedom we have used with generous confidence and candour; not seeking to reveal some undiscovered fault, but only to describe the cause and nature of an error that is great and obvious; and then, with firm assurance modestly expressed, to indicate and justify the remedy.

And now we venture to assume that all our readers recognise the historic status, and the artistic value, of the Master-Workman, and perceive that to ignore him and to restrict the exercise of his imagination in his work is a fraud on human nature, and injurious to all men. This is now evident. Our present working classes are profoundly vulgar. The increase of wages and of general comfort does not much improve them, and instruction only serves to give them larger means to demonstrate their coarseness. Those who know them in their houses tell us that as their wages rise they revel in expensive luxury and display. In this they imitate their betters. The debasement of imagination is a striking characteristic of society, and may be traced from the mean finery of a mechanic's parlour straight to the pompous rubbish that surrounds a duke. Learning is no efficient substitute or supplement, for, without imagination, 'every man is brutish in his knowledge.' We do not undervalue what is now called education, but we object entirely to the misuse of the word. The result of all our 'Education Acts' is not education, but mere teaching and the gift of knowledge. There is something imparted, not 'educated.' But it is not that which goeth into a man, but that which cometh out of him, that defiles or purifies, ennobles or degrades him; and while we merely give him knowledge and prohibit individual interest and expression in his work, the operative still remains but a degraded though intelligent machine, and the agricultural labourer is in every sense made only to 'follow the plough.'

The object of all education is the improvement of the *moral* of the man. Instruction in literature and science sharpens his intellect, and technical instruction, now required by middle-class employers for economic reasons, good in themselves, but socially and philosophically selfish, may increase the workman's value as a tool; but true art workmanship is generous in every way, and in its nature is like mercy, blessing him that gives as well as him that takes. It gives a constant opportunity and wholesome exercise for their imagination to the great fundamental class of working men, and, elevating these, it raises all humanity. Much of the congratulation that we hear about advancing wealth, and science, and mechanical improvement, is truly relevant to nothing but

but advance. The progress is in most cases grovelling and low. Men are not better for it all, but only better off. Will any who have known our Universities these twenty, thirty, forty years, tell us that the more recent men have been of a distinctly higher stamp than those who had preceded them? Is not the proportion of self-culture for its own sake greatly reduced, and the pursuit of learning very much become a hunt for fellowships, or, as upon the turf, to get 'well placed'? This all requires abatement and correction, and the change, as in most moral revolutions, must be made not in the upper but the lower orders of society. Morals do not descend, and Christianity was proclaimed and first received among the poor.

The workmen are our masters, and, we hear, should be instructed; what if this instruction should but lead them to increasing aptitude for selfishness and base enjoyment, and the whole political machine should be a means of levelling the people down to a low state of rude or polished luxury? Nothing can be more dangerous and prejudicial to the State than the neglect of the imaginative power among men. For many years greed has been blessed, and honoured, and exalted to the position of a peace-maker. But greed never has maintained a nation's self-respect and dignity; and it is only by the cultivation of the noble qualities of imagination, which rise greatly above greed, and, seeking true nobility, find it in work and sacrifice, that the position of England as a leader among the nations can be secured and made a blessing. If the imagination is not thus developed, the working men will, as they become instructed, become also increasingly obnoxious and depraved, and vulgar knowingness and vain impatient levity will, as in other regions, be the ruling characteristics of the people.

We have occasionally to regard with pity and some scorn the French elector who declines or fears to vote 'for the salvation of society.' Our working men are similarly impotent, though not perhaps in politics, yet in all that most concerns their actual work. They are acute and clever to a folly about pay, but for all else their minds have been crushed out of them; and in the great and many-sided building trade, ubiquitous and constant in its movement, the whole class of working men is sunk into the lowest state of mental and imaginative feebleness. We have given to the workman power in political affairs, but we entirely deny his right and special fitness to direct his own. He obtains his share numerically in the election of the Government that rules us all, but he is counted quite incapable to manage his own work, and, like a beast of burden or a child, is put in harness or in leading-strings, and reined and guided, 'blinkered' and controlled.

There

There is no question how the working man must be improved. He must first be recognised. Let us suppose that some successful picture-dealer were to quote the various paintings in his gallery as his own productions, and that the names and individuality of all the painters were entirely disregarded, and we shall understand at once the unnatural condition of the workman, and perceive how much the decadence of painting would be promoted by such oblivious folly. This, notwithstanding, is our almost universal custom in regard to every art that we have not dubbed 'fine,' and so the working man becomes an alien and outcast from 'society.'

But we may hear that the upraising of the workman is a revolutionary project, and that its tendency would be to shatter the foundations of society. The truth, however, is entirely otherwise, and we appeal to feelings perfectly conservative when we declare that the great want of England is a wide-spread class of true imaginative workmen—men who, free from jealousy of other ranks, because they feel the dignity and comfort of their own, would never favour violent or revolutionary change, and yet would be most prompt to see and indicate whatever change is needed. These true *gentlemen* would soon become the efficient balance-weight of all society, and from their business contact with all classes, and their sympathy with each, would bring them into harmony throughout the social scale. 'They would maintain the state of the world;' and, their works and ways being entirely public, they would give no opportunity for suspicion or occasion for distrust. None would readily resent their interference or advice; they could speak with the vulgar as well as think with the wise, and without effort would obtain the confidence of the proprietary as well as of the operative classes in a way that what is called the middle class could never hope to emulate.

Having commenced by quoting our Historian's opinion of the method and results of modern architectural practice, let us now collect and hear what Goethe has to say about artistic Dilettanteism. The 'Dilettants,' who still maintain their social and professional influence in architectural affairs, he has described as—

•

'Those who, without any particular talent for art, only give way to the natural imitative tendency in them, and among other things to the imitation of Gothic Architecture. Their passion for imitation has no connection with inborn genius for art. They do little good to artists or to art; but, on the contrary, much harm, by bringing artists down to their level. *The Dilettante is honoured, and the artist is neglected.* In Dilettanteism the loss is always greater than the gain. It takes from

from art its essence, and spoils the public by depriving it of its artistic earnestness and sense of right. It follows the lead of the time; whereas true art gives laws and commands the time. Dilettanteism presupposes art as botchwork does handicraft; and the Dilettante holds the same relation to the artist that the botcher does to the craftsman. From handicraft the way is open to rise in art but not from botchwork. The best of all preparation is to have even the lowest scholar take part in the work of the master. The Dilettante has never more than a half-interest in art, but the artist, who is the true connoisseur, has an unconditional and entire interest in art and devotion to it. The true artist rests firmly and securely on himself, and so incurs the less danger in departing from rules; and may even, by that means, enlarge the province of art itself. Dilettanti, or rather botchers, seem not to strive like the true artist towards the highest possible aim of art, nor to see what is beyond, but only what is beside them; on this account they are always comparing. All Dilettanti are plagiarists. They enervate and pull to pieces all that is original in manner or matter; and at the same time imitate, copy, and piece out their own emptiness with it.

‘The publicity and permanence of architectural works renders the injurious effect of Dilettanteism in this department more universal and enduring, and *perpetuates false taste*; because in art the things that are conspicuous and widely known are generally made to serve again for models. The earnest aim of a true architectural work gives it a harmony with the most important and exalted moments of man; and botchwork in this case *does him an injury in the very point where he might be most capable of perfection.*’

Thus Art is not to be attained by Dilettante schemes or fanciful designs; or by a vain expenditure of wealth; or even by some recondite researches in the path of knowledge. Art is the noble end of steady and laborious work; the glory and reward of honest, thoughtful, self-devoted handicraft. Art, ‘when a reality, indicates something impressive and sublime. It stamps a man with the divine seal; setting him before us as invariably impelled to do a divine thing. Work is not to him a profession, but a vocation. It is not something which he chooses for himself, but for which he is chosen; which he does not advance to because he will, but because he must. The man is not at liberty to decline the call.’ Such was the Master-Workman of the past, whose free imaginative power has ever been the life of Art; and, in like manner, the emancipated Workman, gloriously ‘impelled,’ must always be, and is, the only real hope of English Architecture.

- ART. IV.—1. *Sartor Resartus*. By Thomas Carlyle. Popular edition. London, 1871.  
 2. *Latter-day Pamphlets*. By the Same. Popular. edition. London, 1871.  
 3. *Culture and Anarchy*. By Matthew Arnold, D.C.L. London, 1870.  
 4. *Literature and Dogma*. By the Same. • London, 1873.  
 5. *St. Paul and Protestantism*. By the Same. London, 1869.  
 6. *Studies of the Greek Poets*. By J. A. Symonds. London, 1873.  
 7. *Essays on the Renaissance*. By W. H. Pater. London, 1873.

THE struggle between the Girondins and the Jacobins in the first French Revolution has a far wider significance than the passing strife of rival factions. It represents the rupture between two elementary forces of the Revolution, temporarily combined for a common object of destruction—the men of action and the men of letters. The philosophic party, of which the Girondins were the political expression, had given the movement its first form and impulse, had clothed it in heart-stirring phrases, specious sophistry, and brilliant romance. So long as action was restricted to an assault on existing institutions, the Monarchy, the Aristocracy, and the Church, the Girondins were the men who encouraged and guided the mind of the people. But when, after the revolution of the 10th August, the philosophers found themselves, for the first time in the history of the world, the sole rulers of a great nation, their political incapacity was at once apparent. Not one act of statesman-like energy can be credited to the Girondins during the brief period of their power. They were undecided before the enemy on the frontier, impotent among the mob in Paris, powerful only within the walls of the Assembly, and after a bare year of nominal rule all of the party who were not in hiding in the provinces had perished beneath the guillotine.

What was the cause of a rise so prodigious and a fall so disastrous? The aim of the literary or Girondin party was perfection—a dream that has always attracted and amused the minds of philosophers. Plato had given it form in his ‘Republic,’ Bacon and Sir Thomas More in the ‘Atlantis’ and ‘Utopia.’ But both the last were the mere sportive fancies of practical statesmen, while Plato says of his own republic: ‘Perhaps in heaven there is laid up a pattern of it for him who wishes to behold it, and beholding to organise himself accordingly. And the question of its present or future existence on earth is quite unimportant.’



unimportant.' The problem was not strange to theology, and on speculations of the kind Butler remarks, with his usual strong sagacity: 'Suppose now a person of such a turn of mind to go on with his reveries, till he had at length fixed upon some plan of nature as appearing to him the best;—one shall scarce be thought guilty of detraction against human understanding, if one should say, even beforehand, that the plan which this speculative person would fix on, though he were the wisest of the sons of men, would not be the very best, even according to his own notions of the best.'

Yet this finite capacity of the human mind was precisely what the revolutionary philosophers refused to admit. Each of them assumed that the conception of perfection he had himself formed had a positive external equivalent. Hence their reasoning was constructively valueless, for it was based on a *petitio principii*, or an assumption of what it was really necessary to prove. On the other hand, the magic of the word 'perfection,' and the natural inclination of men to overlook its essentially relative character, made it irresistible as a weapon of destruction. 'It would be advisable,' said Danton, speaking in the Girondin dialect, 'that the Convention should issue an address to assure the people that it wishes to destroy nothing, but to perfect everything; and that if we pursue fanaticism, it is because we desire perfect freedom of religious opinion.' How easy on such premises to argue that all human frailties and crimes were to be ascribed to the imperfection of existing institutions, and that if the belief in revealed religion and the fear of tyrannous authority were destroyed, the mind would re-assert its native dignity! So, at least, reasoned Condorcet, who thought that the first step towards perfection was to annihilate the idea of a personal God. And such was the dream of Madame Roland, who, in her hatred of an aristocracy socially superior to herself, conceived that the earth, relieved of such an incubus, would presently bring forth Brutuses and Timoleons with all the austere virtues of imaginary republics. No wonder, therefore, that when the first fruits of Liberty and Equality appeared in the September massacres and the rise of the Mountain, the Girondins were filled with dismay and despaired of the situation. The character of the party is well expressed in the epigram of Dumouriez, who said that the republic, as conceived by the Girondins, was like the romance of a clever woman.

Girondism has survived the Girondins. Though checked on the field of politics, Philosophy has not yielded one tittle of her pretensions to universal spiritual dominion. But she has shifted

shifted her ground. Perfection, which was once sought in the state of Nature, is now placed in the realms of Art. The wide philosophical movement called 'Culture' has sapped the foundations of positive belief in Germany; its ideas have long been extolled by our own philosophers; it is now in the midst of society itself. 'Are not new lights,' asks one of its professors, whose doctrines we shall presently examine, 'finding free passage to shine in upon us?' They are; and the question is, whether these are mere *ignes fatui*, or proceed, as the philosophers affirm, from the beacon of eternal truth. To every one who reflects it must be plain that society in England is now being exposed to a solvent like that which operated in France before the Revolution. On the other hand, philosophy no longer occupies the same masterful position as before the downfall of the gospel of Rousseau. Her approaches against the outworks of Christianity are masked under a cautious moderation, and even under the show of a patronising friendship. It is, therefore, the interest of those who rest on the truth of an ancient tradition to bring the question to an open issue, and we shall endeavour in the present article to extract from the new Culture, of which we hear so much, a precise account of its meaning, to track it to its source, to subject it to proof, and thus to decide how far its actual powers are equal to its proposed end.

And first we are led to remark on the change in the meaning of the name. In the idea attaching to the word 'Cultivation' there are usually two main elements, society and criticism. By a cultivated age we mean an advanced state of society, recognising certain laws or standards, both moral and intellectual, to which members of the community who desire a character for refinement are expected to conform. Such was the age of Pericles at Athens, of Augustus at Rome, of Louis XIV. in France, of Anne in England. We do not call the age of Elizabeth, though in many essential points a nobler epoch than either of the two last, a cultivated age, because, in the first place, society, in the modern sense, was only in its infancy, and, next, because criticism was almost unknown. Now the meaning in our day specially attaching to the word Culture is 'self-cultivation.' The source of the movement, as we have said, is Germany, and the name of its prophet is perhaps the greatest, and certainly the most representative, in modern literature. No terms of panegyric are too extravagant for his disciples. 'Knowest thou,' says Mr. Carlyle, 'no prophet, even in the vesture, environment, and dialect of this age? None to whom the godlike has revealed itself through all meanest and highest forms of the common, and by him been  
again

again prophetically revealed, in whose inspired melody, even in these rag-gathering and rag-burning days, man's life again begins, were it but afar off, to be divine? I know him, and name him, 'Goethe.' In his early days Goethe was an ardent apostle of the new principles of Rousseau, which he embodied in 'The Sorrows of Werter.' But his clear perception detected their inadequacy even before the catastrophe of the French Revolution.

'One of the first to perceive the faults of these works' (says Mr. Carlyle, in days before he became a Rhapsodist) 'was Goethe himself. In this unlooked-for and unexampled popularity he was far from feeling that he had attained his object: this first outpouring of his soul had calmed its agitations, not exhausted or even indicated its strength, and he now began to see afar off a much higher region, as well as glimpses of the track by which it might be attained. *To cultivate his own spirit*, not only as an author but a man, to obtain dominion over it, and wield its resources in the service of what seemed Good and Beautiful, had been his object, more or less distinctly, from the first, as it is that of all true men in their several spheres. According to his own deep maxim, that "Doubt of any kind can only be removed by action," this object had now become more clear to him; and he may be said to have pursued it to the present hour, with a comprehensiveness and an unwearied perseverance, rarely if ever exemplified in the history of such a mind.'

Evidently there is nothing new in Goethe's aspiration. The subjection of the flesh to the spirit is the very essence of the doctrine of St. Paul. If the culture preached by Goethe be, indeed, the new gospel that Mr. Carlyle maintains, it must possess a larger catholicity and power of being translated into life and action than is shown by Christianity. Now, we doubt if any man has ever done more to render action impossible than Goethe's first English disciple, Mr. Carlyle. Action is what he has always been preaching, and yet in the same breath he has poured contempt on present action of every kind, whether as connected with the past, or constructive of the future. As we all know, he is content that 'old sick society' should be burnt, in the faith that, somehow or other, 'a phoenix' is to arise out of its ashes. Yet who so scornful as he of the vast army of nostrum-mongers, liberals, economists, utilitarians, and other professors of the 'Dismal Science,' who make shift to put something in the place of what they desire to destroy? The reason is that Mr. Carlyle is a poet, and sees the inadequacy of these materialistic systems. But while all great poetry stimulates to action, by 'holding as 'twere the mirror up to nature,' the sphere of Mr. Carlyle's poetry is the supernatural. Posted in his 'watch-tower,'

tower,' in full sight of 'God's Facts,' 'the Immensities,' and 'the Verities,' he stimulates the intellect only to paralyse the power of action. What is his grand fundamental remedy? Self-annihilation. Does this mean more than St. Paul's words, 'I keep under my body and bring it into subjection?' If so, is the sense conveyed in the following passage?—"In fact, Christian doctrine, backed by all the human wisdom I could ever hear of, inclines me to think that Ignatius, had he been a good and wise man, *would have consented at this point to be damned*, as it was clear to him that he deserved to be. Here would have been a healing salve for his conscience, one transcendent *act of virtue*, which it still lay with him, the worst of sinners, to do. "To die for ever, as I have deserved; let Eternal Justice triumph so, since otherwise it may not." Is it not plain that in this passage is nothing of significance for human nature, nothing of practical import, nothing but the intoxication of paradox? So, again, in Mr. Carlyle's social philosophy, in his crusade, for instance, against 'Downing Street,' when, after a whirlwind of invective against the Diabolus spirit of Red Tape, the reader, in a moment's breathing space, looks for the inspired advice, the oracle counsels profoundly, 'Able men! Get able men in Downing Street!' In such bewildering chances do we find ourselves in our journeys with Mr. Carlyle, at one moment transported on a celestial metaphor, the next stranded upon a barren platitude! Why is this? And how comes the serene philosophy of Goethe to be translated into the turbulent and discontented system of his disciple? For our own part, we think the reason is not far to seek. Mr. Carlyle's ideals are wholly un-English. England is not Weimar, nor is the purely literary culture, which could develop itself at liberty in a petty German Court, undisturbed by even the rumour of politics, qualified to succeed amidst the vehement political life of a great and ancient nation.

A far more systematic attempt, however, to naturalise 'Culture' in England has been made by another disciple of Goethe. No one has more persistently preached the necessity of this new religion than Mr. Arnold; but perceiving clearly the impractical nature of Mr. Carlyle's mission, he has thrown his own efforts into the form of exposition, and has in every way sought to popularise his creed by indicating how it is to be embodied in our national life. Nor has he been by any means unsuccessful in engrafting his ideas on literary society. Like all the Girondin party, he knows thoroughly the value of phrases, and the very word 'Culture' itself, 'Perfection,' 'Sweetness and Light,' 'Hebraism,' 'Hellenism,' and others now so commonly found

found in current literature, have been disseminated by his influence. And no wonder, for if any man could found a gospel on refinement it would be Mr. Arnold. Graceful and humane in his temperament, a master alike of literature and style, capable of receiving criticism with temper, and retorting it with wit, this true disciple of Goethe has received from Fortune every gift, except the power 'to see himself as others see him.' 'Culture,' he says, 'is to be recommended as the great help out of our present difficulties,' and if, after examination, the remedy seems to be something less than the philosopher's stone, it will not be for want of clear exposition and unwavering faith on the part of its apostle.

Mr. Arnold, pursuing his meritorious object of making his system precise and popular, starts with a definition: 'Culture, which is the study of perfection, leads us to conceive of true perfection, developing all sides of our humanity, and, as a general perfection, developing all parts of our society.' And he subsequently shows that the question has a religious, political, and social aspect, in which triple division of his subject we shall do our best to follow him.

To be perfectly cultivated we must, according to Mr. Arnold, be perfectly religious, and to be perfectly religious we must have a proper understanding of the Bible. A significant admission from a philosopher of that party which, in its first rise, did its utmost to annihilate Christianity as a baneful superstition! Yet, so far as regards his own end, Mr. Arnold is right; for is it not the precept of the Founder of Christianity, 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect?' The question, however, immediately arises, is the perfection thus enjoined identical with that perfection which consists in a 'harmonious development of all sides of our humanity'? We are thus led to ask for a clear definition of the common and traditional conception of Christianity, and we shall not find it better than in the words of Bishop Butler, a writer for whom Mr. Arnold professes the highest admiration:—

'The divine government of the world, implied in the notion of religion in general and of Christianity, contains in it that mankind is appointed to live in a future state; that everyone shall be rewarded or punished respectively for all that behaviour here which we comprehend under the words virtuous, morally good, or evil; that our present life is a probation, a state of trial, and of discipline for that future one; notwithstanding the objections which men may fancy they have from notions of necessity against there being any such moral plan as this at all; and whatever objections may appear to be against the wisdom and goodness of it, as it stands imperfectly made known to us at present; that the world being in a state of apostasy and wickedness,

wickedness, and the sense of their condition and duty being greatly corrupted among men, this gave occasion for an additional dispensation of Providence, of the utmost importance, proved by miracles, but containing in it many things strange and not to have been expected; a dispensation of Providence which is a scheme or system of things carried on by the mediation of a divine Person, the Messiah, in order to the recovery of the world, yet not revealed to all men, nor proved with the strongest evidence, but only to such a part of mankind, and with such particular evidence, as the wisdom of God thought fit.

Here is a plain and manly statement of Christianity, with all its difficulties, as it has been accepted by every Church, by every sect, and by the vast majority of individual Christians, since the time of its first dispensation. 'A future state of rewards and punishments,' 'our present life a state of probation,' 'a dispensation of Providence carried on by a divine Person, the Messiah,' these are conceptions, which perhaps give a somewhat rude shock to the idea of a perfection looked for in the actual world, and consisting in the serene 'development of all sides of our humanity.' The orthodox belief, however, Mr. Arnold says, is a failure; the working classes will have nothing to say to it. Though it is hard to see how, in the sight of reason, this fact affects the question, Mr. Arnold considers it a valid argument against the truth of the popular faith, and a reason for reversing the time-honoured conclusion respecting Mahomet and the mountain. Since the working classes, he seems to argue, will not come to Christianity, we must suit Christianity to the working classes. To bring about this result he considers it will be necessary to eliminate dogma from religion; in other words, to distil out all the supposed facts on which the Christian revelation is based, and to take the residuum of Idea as the real heart and essence of the matter. For this purpose he proposes to apply to Christianity the highly popular modern doctrine of Evolution. Each age, he says, has had its own conception of Christianity, and each age has been making, slowly but surely, towards the modern professorial standpoint. Something here appears to us somewhat to savour of that *petitio principii*, which we have seen to be such a frequent apparition in revolutionary logic. Mr. Arnold, however, does not hesitate to give the names of great Christian divines as being, like himself, Evolutionists in religion. Thus he shows that Dr. Newman maintains the development of doctrine, though arguing from the premise to a wrong conclusion. Butler also speaks of truths in the Scripture which may yet be discovered. But Dr. Newman is a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and as for the passage which Mr. Arnold quotes from Butler, it is simply an argument from the analogy

of Nature to prove the impossibility of comprehending *per saltum* the whole mystery of Christianity. Butler never meant to say that the same fact could be true at one time and not at another, nor would the man who spoke of 'a divine Person, the Messiah, carrying on a dispensation of Providence,' have allowed the following theory of Mr. Arnold's to be an undiscovered 'truth':—

'The book contains all that we know of a wonderful spirit, far above the heads of his reporters, still farther above the head of our popular theology, which has added its own misunderstanding of the reporters to the reporters' misunderstanding of Jesus. And it was quite inevitable that *anything so superior and profound* should be imperfectly understood by those amongst whom it first appeared, and for a very long time afterwards: and that it should come at last to stand out clearer only by time,—Time, as the Greek maxim says, the wisest of all things, for he is the unfailing discoverer.'

Translating the word 'time,' which the writer is of course too modest to do for himself, we therefore arrive at this result, that the scheme of Christianity, as stated above in the quotation from Butler, and understood by the whole Christian world for nineteen centuries, has been one vast mistake, which has only been cleared up by the arrival of the year 1873 and the interposition of Mr. Arnold.

We do not exaggerate. Let Mr. Arnold himself state what his theory of development embraces:—

'*This premature and false criticism* is all of one order, and it will all go. Not the Athanasian Creed's damnatory clauses only, but the whole creed; not this creed only, but the three creeds: our whole received application of science, popular or learned, to the Bible. For it was an inadequate and a false science, and could not from the nature of the case be otherwise.'

We naturally ask, with some curiosity, What remains? 'The work of Jesus,' Mr. Arnold says, 'was to sift and renew the *idea* of righteousness, and to do this He brought a method and He brought a secret. His apostles, when they preached His gospel, preached *repentance* unto life and *peace* through Jesus Christ. Of these two great words, repentance, we shall find, attaches to the method, and the other, peace, to his secret.' Does Mr. Arnold 'really think this stilted paraphrase of the gospel is the revelation of an 'undiscovered truth'? By no means. 'The holders of ecclesiastical dogma,' he says, 'have always, we must remember, held and professed the Bible dogma' (*i. e.* his own exposition of it) 'too. Their ecclesiastical dogma may have led them to act falsely to it, but they have always held it. The method and secret of Jesus have always been prized.'

Why,

Why, then, is our modern philosopher so anxious to get rid of all Christian dogma outside his own special system? 'The cause lies in the Bible being made to depend on a story, or set of asserted facts, which it is impossible to verify.' The Christian religion, as Mr. Arnold says, and the arguments in defence of it, rest on the assumption of a Personal Ruler of the Universe, and this cannot be verified. Religion, we are told, must no longer be a matter of faith, based on revelation, the evidence for which is based merely on probability, but must be made a matter of science.

'That there is an enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness is verifiable, as we have seen by experience: and that Jesus is the offspring of this power is verifiable by experience also. For God is the author of righteousness; now Jesus is the Son of God, because He gives the method and secret by which alone righteousness is possible. And that He does give this we can verify again by experience; it is so! Try! and you will find it to be so!'

And this is religion in its scientific form which is to convert 'the masses'! Had Mr. Arnold been a little more accustomed to close reasoning, and rather less assured of his own infallibility, he would have perceived that the whole of the above passage is made up of assumptions quite as arbitrary as any which he deprecates in the popular theology. Take two for instance. How can it be verified that there is 'an enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness'? Clearly this question is one of *metaphysics*. The origin of the moral perception in man is assigned by some to intuition, by others to education, and by Mr. Darwin to a social instinct, arising out of evolution and inheritance. Whichever conclusion a man accepts, it is plain that he must satisfy himself with reasoning which amounts to no more than probability. How, again, can it be verified that righteousness is alone possible by the method of Jesus? Was there no righteousness in the world before the Christian era? St. Paul clearly implies the contrary when he says, 'When the Gentiles which have not the law do *by nature* the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves.'

With this extraordinary facility of verification, however, it may be supposed Mr. Arnold has little difficulty in dealing with any facts that conflict with his own conclusion. Yet for a philosopher who maintains that the whole fabric of historical Christianity is based on a delusion, there is surely much to be accomplished in clearing away those 'miraculous' facts which, as Butler says, prove the divine sanction of the Christian dispensation. As, however, the position of Mr. Arnold is different



from that of philosophers who deny the whole truth of Christianity, he deals little with the quality of the evidence for the Resurrection, the cardinal point of Christian theology, and confines himself almost entirely to an elaborate demonstration that his doctrine, his whole doctrine, and nothing but his doctrine, is the actual doctrine of the Apostles. The object of his essay 'St. Paul and Protestantism' is, he says, 'not religious edification, but the true criticism of a great and misunderstood author.' And this is what St. Paul really meant by the Resurrection from the Dead:—

'All impulses of selfishness conflict with Christ's feelings. He showed it by dying to them all; if you are one with Him by faith and sympathy, you can die to them also. Then, secondly, if you die with Him, you become transformed by the renewing of your mind, and rise with Him. The law of the spirit which is in Christ becomes the law of your life also, and frees you from the law of sin and death. You rise with Him to *that harmonious conformity with the real and the eternal*, that sense of pleasing God, which is life and peace till it becomes glory. If you suffer with Him, you shall also be glorified with Him.'

There is something almost incredible in this *sang froid*. It is, of course, true that St. Paul speaks of Christ's death and resurrection in the metaphorical sense expounded by Mr. Arnold; but is it not obvious that the whole force of the metaphor is derived from a belief in the actual fact? Had St. Paul's belief been based on mere intellectual perception, what would be the meaning of the passionate cry, 'O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' Or what significance would there be in the experience of Christians of all persuasions, in the self-inflicted penance of St. Benedict, the spiritual conflicts of Luther, and Bunyan's ever-haunting remorse, if the above calm professorial statement were the real sum of the matter? But what follows is more amazing still. We are to believe that when St. Paul spoke to the facts of Christ's resurrection, and based on them the sublime argument which for countless generations has brought hope and consolation to the grave-side, he did not know the meaning of his own words.

'Very likely it would have been impossible for him to imagine his own theology without it' (viz., a belief in the actual Resurrection), 'but

"Below the surface stream, shallow and light,  
Of what we say we feel, below the stream,  
As light, of what we think we feel, there flows,  
With noiseless current strong, obscure, and deep,  
The central stream of what we feel indeed,"

and

and in St. Paul's case this happens to coincide with the ideas of Mr. Arnold.

This is no place for theological argument. We have contented ourselves with a simple exposition of Mr. Arnold's philosophy, because we wish to show that, while surveying the popular faith with superior disdain, he does not understand its meaning. 'A perfection developing all sides of our humanity' is what everybody desires, but the real question is, How is this harmony to be attained when the very principles of our nature are in apparent conflict? To the discord between the desires and the will all philosophy, Heathen or Christian, bears testimony. 'The universal human experience is expressed in Plato's story of Leontius and his eyes,\* in Ovid's words, 'Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor,' as well as in St. Paul's declaration, 'When I would do good evil is present with me.' What distinguishes Christianity from philosophy is its recognition of the truth that fact must be met with fact, that the radical imperfection of the human will can only be cured by the superintention of a perfect and Divine Power. The belief in this external power, exemplified either in St. Paul's conversion or the conversion of Sampson Staniforth, the Methodist soldier, by which Mr. Arnold vainly endeavours to depreciate St. Paul's, is the motive of Christian practice. But Mr. Arnold's notable scheme of culture is to cure selfishness by means of self, to oppose bare idea to hard fact, to enforce a law, of which he would abolish the sanction. It is possible that, when he goes to 'the masses,' and, after denying the Resurrection of the Dead, proves to them how necessary it is for every one who would become a cultivated person 'to rise to a harmonious conformity with the real and the eternal,' his hearers may not discover that he is discoursing platitudes. But in that case we shall next expect to hear of him lecturing to vast and eager audiences in the United States on the 'undiscovered truths,' that honey placed on the tongue produces a sensation of sweetness, or that wood when brought into contact with fire is accustomed to be consumed.

We come now to the politics of culture, and, after a general survey of the region, we find ourselves rather in the difficulty of St. Patrick, who, having to write on snakes in Ireland, could only say, 'In Ireland there are no snakes.' It is not that Mr. Arnold has nothing edifying to tell us on the subject. Far from it. Nature made him a critic, and did not indispose him to be a 'candid friend.' 'I am a Liberal,' he says, 'but a Liberal tempered by experience and reflection,' and his attitude towards

---

\* Plato, Republic, Book iv.

popular Liberalism is all that we, who do not profess that creed, can desire. He sees plainly that the Irish Church was not dis-established in the interest of Eternal Justice, but to satisfy the political importunity of a coalition of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists. He would probably admit that the Irish Land Bill sprang out of considerations not wholly dissimilar. He has no more faith in ballot-boxes, reform bills, cotton, railways, and other machinery, as means to perfection, than Mr. Carlyle. And he has also—a failing not prevalent in his party—a propensity to humour, and a genius for embodying the weak points of his friends in lively caricatures and suggestive phrases, which to the Tory mind are full of salt and savour.

Culture, however, we must remember, pretends to be something more than critical; it is to help us out of our present difficulties. One of our present difficulties, as Mr. Arnold justly says, is that we have no sound centre of authority. We have no idea, like some of the Continental nations, of a State as a centralising and directing power, and consequently our constitutional system of checks, whenever an emergency arises, is apt to leave us at the mercy of any powerful will, like Mr. Beales or Mr. Bradlaugh, who, having the courage of their opinions, can seize on the situation. All very true. Still, we cannot help feeling that this light-hearted criticism comes rather strangely from one of a party whose whole policy has been to remove power from the aristocracy, which, however imperfect, was certainly a centre, and to vest it exclusively in the middle class, which, outside the Constitution, has neither unity nor cohesion. Mr. Arnold, however, is a philosopher, and, like all his kind, can stick to his colours and separate his principles from their consequences. 'The salvation' (and he uses the word with quasi-religious unction) 'of the country is to be looked for from the middle,' or, as he calls it, 'the Philistine' class. Only this class must first get rid of its Philistinism, and adopt the means of 'salvation' which Culture points out to it. And what are these? 'To found the idea of a State on our best *self*.'

'By our best self we are united, impersonal, at harmony. We are in no peril from giving authority to this, because it is the truest friend we all of us have, and, when anarchy is a danger to us, it is to this authority we may turn with sure trust.'

Why here is our old friend *Petitio Principii*, this time in the very thinnest disguise, and walking confidently abroad with an ingenuous good faith that is positively refreshing. For is it not obvious that, if all men obeyed their better selves, there would be no need of government at all, and that the real question

tion is (the heart being 'deceitful above all things') 'What is our better self?' and 'How are we to obey it?' We confess a curiosity to learn the exact nature of that harmonious state, which would be compounded of the 'better selves' of such distinguished Liberals as Mr. Arnold, Mr. Miall, Sir Charles Dilke, and Professor Fawcett.

Mr. Arnold will not satisfy us. On the contrary, whenever he seems on the point of making a practical suggestion, he shrinks from applying it. For instance, after an eloquent description of the advantages enjoyed by those schools in Prussia which are under the patronage of the Crown, he shows, by way of contrast, the position of the Crown in England:—

'In England the action of the national guides or governors is for a Royal Prince or a great Minister to go down to the opening of the Licensed Victuallers' or the Commercial Travellers' school, to take the chair, to extol the energy and self-reliance of the Licensed Victuallers or the Commercial Travellers, to be all of their way of thinking, to predict full success to their school, and never so much as hint to them that they are doing a very foolish thing, and that the right way to go to work with their children's education is quite different.'

This is humorous and true,—but what then? Surely, if the argument is sound, it is an argument for placing the Royal centre of authority, whose action Liberals from time immemorial have been seeking to restrict, in a more independent position. Unfortunately though Mr. Arnold is 'a Liberal tempered by experience and reflection,' he is above all a Liberal.

'I do not say,' is his conclusion, 'that the political system of foreign countries has not inconveniences which may outweigh the inconveniences of our own political system; nor am I in the least proposing to get rid of our own political system and to adopt theirs. But a sound centre of authority being what in this disquisition we have been led to seek, and right reason or our best self appearing alone to offer such a sound centre of authority, it is necessary to take note of the chief impediments which hinder in this country the extrication or recognition of this right reason as a paramount authority, with a view to afterwards trying in what way they may be removed.'

It is, in fact, much easier to criticise imperfection than to define perfection. Mr. Arnold is a born critic, but not a constructive statesman, and his help towards relieving us of our present difficulties is purely negative. When asked for positive action he politely declines to commit himself, and with many fine phrases about 'our better self,' 'right reason,' and 'making the will of God prevail,' gracefully bows himself off the political stage.

'Because

'Because machinery is the bane of politics, and an *inward working*, and not machinery is what we want, we keep advising our ardent young Liberal friends to think less of machinery, to stand more aloof from the arena of politics at present, and rather to try and promote with us inward working.'

This naturally leads us to the consideration of a question far wider and more important than Mr. Arnold's particular views—namely, the general relation between letters, for this, after all, is what Culture really means, and modern society. Here we have the deliberate advice of the most polished English writer of the day, that those of his countrymen whose tastes agree with his own should, for a time at all events, secede from politics, which, in England, is the same as saying from public life. We should like to know Mr. Arnold's authority in reason or experience for such strange counsel. Socrates, we believe, said that no wise man would meddle with politics; but Socrates was not an absolute stranger to paradox, nor are we aware that he ever explained how the world was to proceed without government. On the other hand, free society has ever been, and we believe must ever be, political, and the public spirit of a free State will always, directly or indirectly, find expression in its literature. It was so in Athens. The public instruction in the poems of Homer, the representation of the traditional mythology in the public tragedy, and the criticism of current politics on the comic stage, indicate how the noblest forms of art identified themselves with the habits and institutions of the Athenian people. It was so in Rome. Cicero, the representative of Rome's republican statesmanship, is still regarded as the representative of Latin culture. In the '*Georgics*' is embodied the spirit of the ancient agriculture of Rome, as the '*Æneid*' is the monument of her Imperial grandeur. And it is striking evidence of the power possessed by tradition, history, and poetry to keep alive national feeling, that the surest way Juvenal could find for revealing their vices to his degraded countrymen was to compare them with the simple virtues of their fathers.

But if we wish to see what happens where this is not so, where literature fails to incorporate itself in the national life, we have an example in the history of France. The genius of French literature is essentially critical, not creative. With the energies of society crushed by despotism, there was little scope in France for the expansion of poetry, the art above all others in which a free people loves to embody its conceptions of liberty and greatness. The graver works of the French imagination have an air of mannerism and unreality. They strike us as luxuries, purveyed by the most ingenious minds (generally arising

arising from the middle class, so sedulously excluded from all share in affairs) for the enjoyment of a select society, too haughty to provide its own pleasures by the performance of a supposed menial function. In comedy, on the other hand, the French are unsurpassed. But social comedy thrives upon corruption. In criticism they are unequalled. 'The French,' says Dryden, are as much better critics than the English as they are worse poets,' and certainly the characteristic writers of France are Montaigne and Montesquieu, not Corneille or Racine. But criticism without poetry enervates instead of strengthening society. In the final catastrophe of French history we see the fatal results of continued analysis, the perpetual wear and tear of reflection unrelieved by the opportunity of free action. Art and culture, which devote themselves exclusively to search for the causes of life, and not rather to represent examples of noble living, are certain in the end to blind men's eyes to the objects they propose to reveal.

How different have been the fortunes of literature in England ! Though much behind the French in polish and critical perception, England has produced a literature more vigorous and original than her neighbour. At the same time that the elements of civil society began to form themselves under Elizabeth, art and learning struck deep root in the country. The governing classes in England have never regarded the practice of letters as a degrading pursuit ; on the contrary, they have seen in literature a great conservative power. The names of Sackville, Sidney, and Raleigh are amongst the earliest refiners of our language ; the name of Bacon stands pre-eminent in our philosophy ; a large proportion of the names in Johnson's 'Lives of the Poets' belong to the ranks of the nobility and gentry, and, though representing mere mediocrity, serve to show the national inclination to poetry. Yet the prejudices of rank and position have not in England disturbed the true balance in the kingdom of letters. Dryden, as monarch of the Coffee-house, numbered peers among his subjects ; and we venture to say that in no modern society but that of England could a man with so many social defects as Johnson have exercised the prerogative that was freely yielded to his noble genius. This freedom and equality has produced its result in the strength, the variety, and the amplitude of our literature ; but, above all, in the influence it has possessed over the national affections and the character of our greatest countrymen. Marlborough avowed that he knew no history but what he learnt from Shakespeare. And what a depth of meaning lies in the pathetic anecdote of Wolfe, who, as he was being rowed towards the Heights of Abraham, repeated

repeated Gray's 'Elcgy' to his companions, exclaiming at the conclusion that he would rather have been the author of the poem than be the victor in the approaching battle!

To explain, therefore, Mr. Arnold's advice, previously quoted, in the face of this public character of our literature, we must remember that we, also, have had our Revolution, which, while proceeding by due course of law, presents in a modified form precisely the same features as the Revolution in France. Liberalism, or the great upward movement of the middle against the aristocratic class, has always contained two elements, the literary and the political, though the relative importance of these is exactly the reverse of what is seen in the French Revolution. Both fractions of the Liberal party have availed themselves of the magic watch-words, Progress and Perfection, though, as usual, the words with each have had a different meaning. Perfection, as defined by the political Liberals, is of a very definite and tangible character; being simply to enjoy the most unrestrained personal liberty, and the most unlimited opportunities of creating wealth, possible under the national constitution. The aims of the literary Liberals, on the other hand, are cosmopolitan and comprehensive, aspiring, as in France, to reconstruct the entire social and moral life of the country on a basis imagined by philosophy. Between such uncongenial allies harmony, of course, could not long be preserved; a sense of disappointment has always been observable in the literary party; and they have at last come to a complete rupture with their political friends, much after the fashion of the Girondists and Jacobins, only that, while in France the quarrel was raised to the heights of tragedy, in England it wears, superficially at all events, the aspect of a broad farce.

The disappointed feelings of the English Girondists are expressed without reserve. 'I am now convinced,' says Mr. Mill, in his 'Autobiography,' 'that no great improvement is possible for mankind without a fundamental change in their constitutional habits of thought.' Mr. Carlyle, as we know, though in his rhapsodies he extols an ideal industrialism, has never ceased to inveigh against the trading classes as they are. But even his invective is nothing compared to the calm, equable, superior disdain which Mr. Arnold expresses for his quondam friends and their principles.

'Culture says: "Consider these people, their way of life, their habits, their manners, the very tones of their voice; look at them attentively, observe the literature they read, the things which give them pleasure, the words which proceed from their mouths, the thoughts which make the furniture of their minds; would any amount  
of

of wealth be worth having with the condition that one was to become just like these people by having it? ”’

On the other side the Liberal society, surveyed in this contemptuously Olympian fashion, is not slow to retort upon ‘people’—to quote the words of Mr. Bright—‘who talk about Culture, by which they mean a smattering of the dead languages of Greek and Latin.’ ‘Perhaps,’ says Mr. Frederic Harrison, a representative Jacobin, ‘the very silliest cant of the day is the cant about Culture. Culture is a desirable quality in a critic of new books, and sits well on a professor of *belles lettres*; but, as applied to politics, it means simply a turn for small fault-finding, love of selfish ease, and indecision in action. The man of culture in politics is one of the poorest creatures alive,’ &c. Better matched combatants it would be impossible to find, or a quarrel more entertaining to watch, were it not for a consideration of the more serious issues it involves.

Taste, it is plain, does not enjoy the same appreciation in England to-day as under the rule of the aristocracy. Art and letters, instead of forming part of the daily life of a leisured and refined society, are regarded rather as stimulants for the imagination, which, steadily suppressed during the hours of business, is liberated for brief intervals of feverish excitement. We find, therefore, a constant tendency to depreciate the standard of taste, for, besides the want of leisure required for the mastery of classical models, there is a natural inclination of liberty to rebel against the limitations these models impose, while the feelings of thorough believers in the Manchester school of material progress are humiliated by the thought that they have anything to learn from people who lived before the Christian era. Rich men, they feel, have their intellectual desires, as well as their bodily wants, and in each case money should command the required luxury. We are, indeed, in the midst of a period, the approach of which Goldsmith long ago saw and deplored, when money, rather than honour, becomes the prime motive of literary production. The logical consequences of the law of demand and supply in literature have lately been pressed by the ‘Times’ in an article of extraordinary plainness:—

‘If one novel in ten, or one poem in a thousand, be worth reading at all, it is as much as we can reasonably expect to find. It is certain, however, that the rest supply a want which is really felt, and give undoubted pleasure to a large class of readers. If the object of literature is to give pleasure, and to divert the mind from the unpleasant realities of life, *it is impossible to refuse some praise to the performance which does this, for however brief a period.*’

If the object of literature be what is defined by that great journal,



journal, a single copy of which Mr. Cobden valued above the whole history of Thucydides, no doubt this reasoning is just, but in that case we cannot rightly refuse our praise to the art of the procuress or the trade of the opium-monger.

Every generous feeling revolts against this vulgar and cynical despotism. But are we to conclude because national taste is decaying, that self-culture alone is to be pursued, without consideration of the instincts, the traditions, the character of the society to which we belong? Such seems to be Mr. Arnold's advice, and it is certainly widely followed. 'Free literature' is as popular a cry in many quarters as a 'free Church' or a 'free breakfast-table.' Culture is regarded as the badge of distinction between the refined few and the rude many; Lessing and Herder are taken as the models for English criticism, rather than Johnson or Macaulay. Now to see what kind of perfection is likely to result from this 'inward working,' we must observe the effect produced upon our higher literature by its repudiation of all intercourse with existing society.

In the first place the secession develops literary sacerdotalism, a priestliness marked by all the assumption of ecclesiastics without any of their prescriptive right. Mr. Carlyle, who regards the Christian religion in its revealed sense as obsolete, writes in the following extravagant strain respecting literary influence:—

"'But there is no religion,' reiterates the Professor. 'Fool! I tell thee there is. Hast thou well considered all that lies in this immeasurable froth-stream we name Literature? Fragments of a genuine Church Homiletic lie scattered there, which Time will assort: nay, fractions even of a Liturgy could I point out now.'"

This, no doubt, represents the tendency of artists, men of science, poets, and professors of polite letters generally, to form themselves into a priesthood for propagating a religion of Ideas. But what grounds are there for supposing that such a religion would ever command a popular assent? We have never heard that Euripides and the Sophists were able in any way to replace that belief in the gods and in old-fashioned morality which they found it so stimulating to question. Has the philosophy of Rousseau or Voltaire laid one stone towards reconstructing the ruined society of France? And if we consult the oracles of our own Culture what do we find? There is not one of Mr. Carlyle's leading ideas, 'self-annihilation,' 'temptation in the wilderness' (after the manner of 'Teufelsdröck'), or 'conversion,' which, when divested of its grotesque disguise, is not found to be a parody of some plain and simple precept in the New Testament. As for Mr. Arnold's revised version of Christianity we have already

already examined its claims. May we not, therefore, argue with something like certainty that, however dissimilar in other respects the parallel may be, the moral and would-be religious schemes of our modern philosophers will have no wider influence than the doctrines of the mythological rationalists at Athens?

In the second place, the sacerdotal character of modern culture prevents all application of the very principle, 'know thyself!' on which its professors base their theology. For when did an irresponsible 'priesthood, nay, when did unrestrained human power of any kind, ever enjoy self-knowledge? Mr. Carlyle has truly spoken of 'the folly of that impossible precept, "know thyself," till it be translated into the possibly partial one, "know what thou canst work at."' Doubt of any sort, Goethe's disciples have always been telling us, can only be removed by action; yet, as we have seen, they have one and all hopelessly failed to show what action is possible for them apart from the society by which they are surrounded. Can anything be more impotent than the course Mr. Arnold, in one of his poems, seems to assign to himself:—

' Wandering between two worlds, one dead,  
The other powerless to be born ' ?

In what does such a course naturally end? In universal criticism. To view an ideal perfection from the heights of an intellectual Pisgah, and, in a world where all intelligences are felt to be inferior to his own, to settle every debatable matter by reference to his 'better self,' such is the only action possible to the most distinguished professor of modern culture. And one thing is evident,—this conscious superiority has not opened to him the door of self-knowledge. Had he really known himself, could the apostle of the true 'Bible dogma,' of 'epieikeia, or the mild reasonableness of Christ,' have spoken of the doctrine of the Trinity as 'a fairy tale of the three Lord Shaftesburys'? Would he not, on the contrary, have perceived that to jest on a matter which, to nine-tenths of his countrymen, is a matter of religious belief places him for a time on a level with one whom he does not particularly admire, namely, Mr. Bradlaugh? Again, if the polite professor of Hellenism knew himself, would he, who must remember so well the exquisitely urbane humour of Theophrastus in his 'Characters'—portraits evidently drawn from the closest observation, yet without one personal touch—have thought that he was indulging his Greek taste in his highly-spiced personal descriptions of Lord Elcho, the Rev. W. Cattle, and Sir Thomas Bateson? Self-knowledge  
would

would have told him it was impossible for true taste to have written such a sentence as this: 'From such an ignoble spectacle as that of poor Mrs. Lincoln—a spectacle to vulgarise a whole nation—aristocracies undoubtedly preserve us.' For if this were really a specimen of 'that true grace and serenity of which Greece and Greek art suggest the admirable ideals of perfection,' should we not all turn in preference to those barbarous notions of courtesy and consideration for others which are inculcated by the traditions of modern society? Self-knowledge would have suggested to him that there was something slightly comical in his attempt, Protestant of Protestants and Dissenter of Dissenters as he is, to entice back the Nonconformists into the bosom of the National Church. Finally, if he, indeed, knew himself, Mr. Arnold, it may be, would have more severely questioned the propriety of his Attic irony; for he would then see that the whole point of the Socratic irony, of the philosopher's pretended inferiority to his opponents, lay in the subsequent *demonstration* of his logical superiority to them. Whereas, in Mr. Arnold's ironical descriptions of the 'Barbarians' and 'Philistines,' we find no positive standard of measurement, but mere reference to certain arbitrary ideals, 'right reason,' 'the will of God,' 'sweetness and light,' all of which phrases are only ingenious methods of contrasting the imperfection of the thing criticised with the perfection of the critic. But if the critic's whole position rests on an unproved assumption, criticisms of this sort at once fall to the ground, and leave nothing behind them but surprise at their author's assurance. Indeed, if we wished for an unimpeachable proof for the necessity of some 'centre of authority,' such as society in England once afforded, to restrain the unwarrantable pretensions of men of letters, we know not where we should so readily find it, than—spite of all his infinite grace, penetration, and accomplishment—in the works of Mr. Arnold.

But, lastly, the kind of criticism which springs from constant introspection and monastic study, lands its professors in conclusions of the purest sophistry and a repudiation of the authority of common sense. The following passage from 'Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship' appears to be a vindication of the extremest claims of individual liberty based on unqualified scepticism:—

'Life lies before us as a huge quarry lies before the architect: none deserves the name of architect except when, out of this fortuitous mass, he can combine with the greatest economy, durability, and fitness, some form, *the pattern of which originated in his spirit*. All things without us, nay, I may add, all things on us, are mere elements; but deep

deep within us lies that creative force which out of these can produce what they were meant to be; and which leaves us neither sleep nor rest till, in one way or another, without us or on us, that same may have been produced.'

It is strange how exactly the doctrine of the great modern Sophist coincides with that of the Greek sceptic Protagoras. The above compendious manifesto of literary Liberalism is a mere repetition of the well-known paradox that the individual mind is the measure and, in a sense, the maker of all things,—a conclusion which destroys all distinction between what is true and false, while it bases knowledge on pure sensation. In this principle lies the great cardinal difference between the old and catholic, and the modern and individual, forms of literature, and in every kind of contemporary writing, religious, philosophical, poetical, critical, we see the principle applied. It is of course the justification of the critical school of poetry, originated in England by Wordsworth, which places the value and true nature of external objects in the states of feeling that these produce in the individual. It is the first principle, also, of the French school of romance, and of quasi-dramatic writers, like Mr. Browning, who construct their characters out of an analysis of abstract motive. But it was not the creative method of Homer, Shakespeare, or Sir Walter Scott, who, deriving their impressions from experience and observation of the external world, reproduced these in their natural forms, though heightened and characterised by poetic imagination and individual genius.

What we are now, however, chiefly concerned with is to observe the influence of Goethe's principle as applied to the sphere of culture or criticism. And it is curious to note how closely, and perhaps unconsciously, the modern Sophists tread in the steps of Protagoras, and how, by denying all positive distinctions between what is true and false, by maintaining that what appears true to any man is true to *him*, they press to their logical conclusion that criticism should be a matter of feeling not of judgment. The quality that is most in favour with our modern critics is 'tact.' 'Perhaps,' says Mr. Arnold, 'the quality specially needed for drawing the right conclusion from the facts, when one has got them, is best called *perception*, delicacy of perception.' Now criticism, in the old and honest acceptance of the word, can only mean the act of judging from evidence, and the judgments formed, as well as the premises from which they are drawn, must be plain and palpable to common sense. We are as much bound to apply this method to problems of taste, as to questions of science or of practical conduct, though as the subject-matter of the former is more obscure and debatable,

no doubt the conclusion arrived at will always have a smaller degree of certainty. The critic who forms a judgment on a matter of taste and feeling is simply required to lay his premises before his audience in the clearest possible shape, leaving the jury to consider whether his conclusion is just. But 'tact' is evidently considered by Mr. Arnold to be a peculiar gift, a spiritual insight, which enables its possessor to see farther through a stone wall than is permitted to the common reason. In point of fact, we find it to be a quality chiefly cultivated by French writers, and consisting in the ability to draw vast conclusions from almost invisible premises. This mode of judging has the advantage of being easy. Given a quick perception, a lively fancy, a wide knowledge of books, and a faculty for skipping over awkward negative facts, it is plain that a bold dogmatic affirmation is certain to impress the mind bewildered in the region of the uncertain or the unknown. It was by a remarkable exercise of 'tact' that Dr. Kencaley constructed the character of Roger Tichborne out of his own imagination. Fortunately the 'insight' of the learned counsel was unequal to contend with the weight of overwhelming evidence, marshalled against him with unrivalled clearness and precise arrangement. But when a critic, adopting the same principle, assures his readers in the most persuasive style that his 'perception' convinces him St. Paul did not understand the meaning of his own theology, the assertion is attractive, because it is a paradox, and safe, because it is beyond the region of proof.

Now, how do the modern critics seek to strengthen the sophistry of their position? In the first place, like their Greek prototypes, they have invented an art of rhetoric. If we once concede the position of Protagoras that all truth is relative to the individual, it follows, as a matter of course, that the prime object of education should be to cultivate individual perception. And this is just what Mr. Arnold wants. The great secret of life, in his eyes, is to give an air of philosophy to commonplace, 'to let,' as he says, our 'consciousness play freely round our present operations and the stock notions on which they are founded, so as to show what these are like, and how related to the intelligible law of things, and auxiliary to true human perfection.' Of course this *modus operandi* results in a science of style. All Mr. Arnold's skill is expended on giving an apparently general character to his own personal perceptions by crystallising them in precise forms of expression. Men naturally suppose that words represent things, and just as Gorgias caught the Athenians by his antithetical sentences and curious compounds, so are the cultivated world persuaded that Mr. Arnold's

Arnold's literary shibboleths, numerous as those of a religious sect, have a positive novel significance. Yet it is plainly a mere device of rhetoric when he ascribes the impression which he himself derives from the New Testament to the inspiration of the 'Zeit-Geist,' or 'Time-Spirit;' and rhetoric again teaches him to conceal the purely esoteric nature of such criticisms, as that Byron was a 'Philistine,' and Pope 'provincial,' under the piquant dogmatism of his language.

This art of spiritualising language has received a curious development.\* As culture has turned poetry into criticism so does it transform criticism into poetry. Aristotle blamed the Sophists for making prose poetical, observing acutely that those who wrote in this manner sought to conceal the poverty of their thought by the showiness of their style.\* Poetical prose, however, introduced by Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Carlyle, has made rapid advances in England. The following extract from Mr. Pater's criticism on Leonardo da Vinci's picture 'La Gioconda' is a good specimen of this epicene style:—

'The presence that so strangely rose beside the waters is expressive of what in the ways of a thousand years man had come to desire. Hers is the head upon which all the ends of the world are come, and the eyelids are a little weary. It is a beauty wrought out from within upon the flesh, the deposit, little cell by cell, of strange thoughts, and fantastic reveries, and exquisite passions. Set it for a moment beside one of those white Greek goddesses or beautiful women of antiquity, and how would they be troubled by this beauty into which the soul, with all its maladies, has passed! All the thought and experience of the world have etched and moulded there in that which they have of power to refine and make expressive the outward form, the animalism of Greece; the lust of Rome, the reverie of the Middle Age, with its spiritual ambition and its imaginative loves, the return of the Pagan world, the sins of the Borgias.'

Now all this is plain, downright, unmistakable poetry. The picture is made the thesis which serves to display the writer's extensive reading and the finery of his style. Of reasoning in the ordinary sense there is positively none. 'The eyelids are a little weary,' therefore it is quite plain that 'all the ends of the earth are come upon her head.' The beauty is different from the Greek type. What then can be more obvious than that this particular face expresses the whole experience of mankind between the age of Phidias and Leonardo? The lady appears to Mr. Pater to have a somewhat sensual expression. A fact which fully warrants a critical rhetorician in concluding that she is an unconscious incarnation of all the vices which he has

\* Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, iii. i. 9.

found preserved in the literature of the Renaissance. Judgments of this kind, we are told, are the result of 'penetrative sympathy' or 'perceptive insight.' It may be so; we cannot say that the qualities Mr. Pater discovers in this picture are not to be found there. What we can say is that, as the reasoning in the above passage assumes a knowledge in the critic of motives which are beyond the reach of evidence, there is no justification for calling that criticism which is in fact pure romance. In some cases we may go farther, and show that the freemasonry acquired by perpetual reading, uncorrected by actual observation, is really of a kind to weaken that acute sagacity which is necessary for a judge. For instance, by an error precisely resembling Winckelmann's absurd overestimate of Raphael Mengs, a critic of such natural good sense and sound judgment as Mr. Symonds, whose book we have classed with Mr. Pater's at the head of our article, has been induced to assert that an execrable American scribbler, one Walt Whitman, is the true representative of Greek life in the nineteenth century. A hundred other instances might be quoted to prove how critics who reject the natural standards of common sense in favour of private perceptions derived from books are made the dupes of quackery and imposture. Everywhere we see examples to confirm the truth of Milton's reproach :—

'The man who reads  
Incessantly, and to his reading brings not  
A spirit and judgment equal or superior  
(And what he brings why need he elsewhere seek?),  
Uncertain and unsettled still remains.  
Deep versed in books, but shallow in himself,  
Crude or intoxicate, collecting toys  
And trifles for choice matters, worth a sponge,  
As children gathering pebbles by the shore.'

We have sought to show that the results of 'inward working' in literary culture are not satisfactory. It is not every man whose Dæmon is so trustworthy as that of Socrates. If, then, the characteristics we have observed be in themselves unhealthy, is there not probably something unsound in the source from which they spring? Liberalism, or religion based on 'self-worship, of which self-culture is the last and the logical development, has been the darling creed of Europe for a hundred years, yet it has ever failed to take firm root in society. Philosophic Liberalism, the State of Nature, or the Gospel according to Rousseau, failed irretrievably at the French Revolution. Commercial Liberalism, the mercantile State of Nature, or the Gospel according to Cobden,

Cobden, is generally discredited, and in the eyes even of its professors is at least inadequate. Academic Liberalism, the State of Art, or the Gospel according to Goethe, must also fail, for this, too, is founded on the false principle of self-worship. Proofs are not wanting that it has failed already. For whereas it proposes to replace what it considers the obsolete catholic standards of antiquity, it introduces us to nothing but the Babel of Sects. In education, in art, its effects are seen alike. Every agitator against the classics as an imperfect educational basis is certain that they could be well replaced by the particular study to which he has confined his own attention. With the innovators in poetry and criticism it is the same; 'there is no law in the land; every man does that which is good in his own eyes.' What, in a word, is the general tendency of 'Culture' but to encourage a passion for private and impossible ideals? Some wish to 'Hellenise' our public life, to recover, as they say, the Greek standard, an aspiration that appears to us to resemble Mrs. Blimber's, who declared that she could die happy if she could but see Cicero in his Tusculan villa. Others, again, desire to mediævalise our manners, and Mr. Ruskin is founding a republic on the principle of Atlantis and Utopia, to be governed by the laws of Florence in the fourteenth century. Probably most of our literary Liberals would re-echo the sense of the complaint made lately with an almost sublime egotism in 'Fors Clavigera':—

'That it should be left to me to begin such a work with only one man in England, Thomas Carlyle, to whom I can look for steady guidance, is alike wonderful and sorrowful to me. I am left utterly stranded and alone in life and in thought.'

A melancholy, but not an uncommon, experience. And who is to blame? Society, says Mr. Ruskin; but we venture to doubt.

Yet these wild visions are but irregular symptoms of the indisposition which the nation itself has lately shown to content itself with the principles of Manchester, without any scope for the exercise of its nobler powers of imagination and feeling. But if all novel schemes in pursuit of this higher end have proved futile, is it not possible that in the Christian Revelation and our national history we have still a standard of noble living in our midst? We believe Butler to be absolutely right in his argument from probability:—

'In questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, where more satisfactory evidence cannot be had, if the result of examination be that there appears any the least presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question, even in matters of speculation, and in matters of practice will lay us under



an absolute and formal obligation in point of prudence and of interest to act upon the presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in doubt which is the truth.'

We have been content, throughout our argument, to meet philosophy on its own ground, and the real question is this, Has, or has not the system, which for nineteen centuries has satisfied minds the wisest and most unsophisticated, which has proved intelligible alike to the hearts of rich and poor, a greater presumption in its favour than those systems which have never extended their influence beyond literary sects, and even among these are being perpetually rejected as inadequate? The constant aspiration of the human heart is towards what is higher than itself, as is shown by Mr. Carlyle's phrase 'self-annihilation,' and Mr. Arnold's phrase 'our better self,' yet no scheme of modern philosophy has suggested how we are to escape from 'the shadow of ourselves.' Christianity solves the enigma, and provides the means, as much more completely than 'Culture,' as the belief in God is larger than the idea of our better self, as much more effectually than philosophy, as the Christian exposition of our duty to God and to our neighbour is more practical than the paradox of self-annihilation. And if it be true, as in a sense it is, that doubt of any kind can only be removed by action, where is there such scope for action as in Christian liberty? Were there, indeed, an inherent repugnance between those elements of our nature which Mr. Arnold calls the Hebraic and Hellenic, as certain fanatics have urged, this, might be an argument against a religion which would tend to suppress the noblest human powers. But there is none. It cannot be said that the faith out of which modern civilisation has sprung has dwarfed the energies of mankind. The scheme under which the intellect of Bacon and Newton could expand has nothing in itself hostile to science; the atmosphere which invigorated the imagination of Shakespeare has not been fatal to letters, nor has the religion which the genius of Raffaele could glorify been unproductive of art. Great action in the sphere of art and letters is encouraged, where men are content to take for granted the first principles on which human society depends. It becomes impossible only when they spend all their intellectual energies on analysis, in the idle endeavour to solve questions which are by nature incapable of proof.

To conclude, we desire a culture that shall be social, public, national, that shall be breathed from the common air, not elaborated out of the individual mind. There is a state of nature to be found in modern society, though not, as Rousseau taught, in a return to the simplicity of the savage or the shepherd. The  
praise

praise of being 'natural' we ascribe to those who, with unconscious grace, without consideration of effect, perform the duties and maintain the dignity proper to their condition in society. The standards of honour, courtesy, politeness, refinement,—all that is comprised in that sense of what is due to others as well as to ourselves, which we call by the name of good breeding, and which is the result of complex traditions, and continuous development, these qualities are as far above the manufacture of art as they are beyond the reach of analysis. Formed as they have been out of instincts and characteristics which have made society in England stable and free, the laws which enforce these virtues should not be questioned, but obeyed. We believe that no modern nation has merited better than England the noble eulogium passed by Pericles on the Athenians, when he told them they had learned how to reconcile a sense of public greatness with a toleration of individual taste. Happy will it be for ourselves if, with our passion for private liberty, we retain that public spirit without which liberty would soon cease to exist! In spite of the sectarianism which the miserable principles of the Manchester school have long served to propagate, we look on the recent judgment of the nation as a proof that the body of the people preserves a sense of true unity. We are persuaded that in our country still burns that ancient fire springing out of love of the soil and patriotic pride which animated the dying apostrophe of John of Gaunt to

'This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England!'

It is this reverence for our history which forms the public conscience, and is a pledge that we cannot be false without shame to the great actions of our fathers. To the kindling and strengthening of this conscience we desire to see all the nobler energies of our art and letters contribute. This to our mind is the groundwork of true Culture. 'Very small by the side of the Eternities!' says Mr. Carlyle. 'Very un-Hellenic!' adds Mr. Arnold. 'Old-fashioned!' cries Liberal Progress, in the spirit of Aristophanes' Unjust Argument, 'eighteenth century, smelling of stage-coaches, Magna Charta, and the Heptarchy.' 'True it is,' we reply with the Just Argument, 'that old-fashioned Culture does not consist of constant self-analysis, perpetual depreciation of our fathers, everlasting glorification of ourselves; but at any rate it is the Culture which reared the men of Trafalgar and Waterloo!'

Α. ἀρχαῖά γε καὶ Διπολιώδη καὶ τεττίγων ἀνάμεστα  
καὶ Κηκείδων καὶ Βουφονίων

Δ. ἀλλ' οὐν ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνα  
ἐξ ὧν ἄνδρας Μαραθωνομάχας ἡμῇ παιδευσὶς ἔθρεψεν.

11'

ART.

ART. V.—*La Vie d'un Patricien de Venise au Seizième Siècle. —Les Doges—La Charte Ducale—Les Femmes à Venise—L'Université de Padoue—Les Préliminaires de Lépante, &c., d'après les Papiers d'Etat des Archives de Venise.* Par Charles Yriarte. Paris, 1874.

MARC ANTONIO BARBARO was a Venetian noble of illustrious birth, who filled successively each of the highest offices in the Republic, with the exception of the Dogeship, which he narrowly missed. He was born in 1518 and died in 1595; and adopting him as the type of the patrician of the sixteenth century, the author of the book before us has undertaken to connect or associate with his career a full description of the laws, customs, manners, and policy of the Queen of the Adriatic in the height of her prosperity and the fullness of her pride. Thus, *à propos* of Barbaro's rank, we are treated to a sketch of the patrician order, with its privileges: on his marriage, to a disquisition on Venetian women. His nomination to an embassy suggests the fertile topic of diplomacy; while his candidature for the Dogeship gives occasion for a complete account of this exalted office with its attributes. The conception is ingenious, and the execution leaves little to desire as regards learning, critical acuteness, and discriminating research. The tone, spirit, and intention of the work are excellent: but it wants life, light, colour, and illustration. The Patrician, instead of being, as we too fondly hoped, the centre of a series of animated groups, is too frequently treated as a peg on which dissertations and descriptions might be hung. Except in two or three episodes of his career, he is little better than a lay figure, slenderly draped, without expression or individuality; and as for the romance, poetry, mystery, dramatic or melodramatic interest, traditionally blended with Venetian annals, M. Yriarte's pages are as free from them as if the people under consideration were the prosaic matter-of-fact Dutch. And yet there is scarcely a prominent incident or turning-point in those annals which does not read more like a fiction than a fact; and so obscurely grand is the subject, that the simplest preface or introduction brings the imaginative faculty into play.

'In the northern angle of the Adriatic is a gulf, called *lagune*, in which more than sixty islands of sand, marsh, and sea-weed have been formed by a concurrence of natural causes. These islands have become the City of Venice, which has lorded it over Italy, conquered Constantinople, resisted a league of all the kings of Christendom, long carried on the commerce of the world, and bequeathed to nations the model of the most stable government

government ever framed by man.\* These are the reflections with which Count Daru introduces his carefully finished and well-proportioned picture of the Republic in all the vicissitudes of her fortunes. The fresh materials accumulated by recent explorers of her archives have rather stimulated than allayed curiosity.† She is still vaguely known and imperfectly understood; and we propose, with M. Yriarte's aid, to call attention to such passages in her history and peculiarities in her institutions, as may help to solve the social and political problems presented by them. We shall also show, as we proceed, how far the leading works of fiction of which the scenes are laid in Venice, agree or disagree with the facts.

The islands of the lagune could hardly be said to be inhabited, being merely used as places of occasional resort by fishermen, until towards the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, when a settled population began to be formed of refugees:—

‘A few in fear,  
Flying away from him whose boast it was  
That the grass grew not where his horse had trod,  
Gave birth to Venice. Like the waterfowl,  
They built their nests among the ocean waves.’‡

The oldest document extant relating to Venetian history, is a decree of the Senate of Padua, A.D. 421, ordering the construction of a town on Rialto, the largest of the isles, with the view of bringing together in a single community the scattered inhabitants of the rest for the purposes of mutual protection and support. They appear to have been left free to choose their own form of government; for we find that each island had at first its own magistrate: the magistrates of the most considerable being

---

\* ‘Histoire de la République de Venise,’ &c. Par P. Daru, de l’Académie Française. Seconde édition, revue et corrigée. Paris, 1821. In eight vols.

† An enduring debt of gratitude is owing from all recent students of Venetian history to M. Armand Baschet. We particularly refer to ‘Les Archives de Venise, Histoire de la Chancellerie Secrète, &c., par Armand Baschet. Paris, Henri Plon, l’imprimeur-éditeur, Rue Garancière, 1870’: a book full of curious information and interesting details.

‡ Rogers’s ‘Italy.’ These lines are paraphrased, without acknowledgment, from Gibbon. ‘It is a saying worthy of the ferocious pride of Attila, that the grass never grew on the spot where his horse had trod. \* Yet the savage destroyer undesignedly laid the foundations of a republic which revived, in the feudal state of Europe, the art and spirit of commercial industry. . . . The minister of Theodoric compares them, in his quaint declamatory style, to waterfowl who had fixed their nests on the bosom of the waves.’—(‘Decline and Fall,’ chap. xxxv.) In his ‘Italy,’ Rogers has throughout treated the historians and chroniclers as Byron accuses ‘sepulchral Grahame’ of having treated the scriptural writers:

‘Brooks into blank the Gospel of St. Luke,  
And boldly pilfers from the Pentateuch.’

called Tribunes Major, the others, Tribunes Minor, and the whole being equally subject to the council-general of the community; which thus constituted a kind of federal republic. This lasted nearly 800 years, when it was found that the rising nation had fairly outgrown its institutions. Dangerous rivalries arose among the tribunes. Their divided authority weakened the common action, and their administration became a general subject of complaint. At a meeting of the Council-General in A.D. 697, the Patriarch of Grado proposed the concentration of power in the hands of a single chief, under the title of Doge or Duke. The proposition was eagerly accepted, and they proceeded at once to the election of this chief. 'It will be seen (remarks Daru) that the Dogeship saved independence and compromised liberty. It was a veritable revolution, but we are ignorant by what circumstances it was brought about. Many historians assert that the change was not effected till the permission of the Pope and the Emperor was obtained.'

The first choice fell on Paolo Luca Anabesto. It was made by twelve electors, the founders of what were thenceforth termed the electoral families. The Doge was appointed for life: he named his own counsellors: took charge of all public business; had the rank of prince, and decided all questions of peace and war. The peculiar title was meant to imply a limited sovereignty, and the Venetians uniformly repudiated, as a disgrace, the bare notion of their having ever submitted to a monarch. But many centuries passed away before any regular or well-defined limits were practically imposed; and the prolonged struggle between the people and the Doges, depending mainly on the personal character of the Doge for the time being, constitutes the most startling and exciting portion of their history.

The first Doge proved a wise and sagacious ruler. He reigned twenty years. The second, Marcello Tegaliano, did equally well. The third, Urso, elected in 726, was restless and ambitious. He seized the first opportunity to engage in warlike operations, and it was under him that the Venetians made their first essay as a military power by land. He took Ravenna by assault, and based such pretensions on his victory, that, after Heraclea (then the capital) had been distracted and split into factions for two years, the people rose, forced their way into his palace, and cut his throat. He had reigned eleven years; long enough to sicken them of Doges for the nonce, so, not wishing to revert to tribunes, they appointed a chief magistrate to be elected annually, under the title of *maestro della militia*. Five such magistrates were named, and ruled in succession, when the institution came to an untimely end with the fifth. For some unexplained reason

reason or possibly caprice, the populace rose again, deposed him, and put out his eyes. The Dogeship was then restored in the person of Theodal Urso (son of the last Doge), who quitted Heraclea for Malamocco, which thus became the capital. Unluckily he excited suspicion by constructing a fort at the mouth of the Adige; and a demagogue, named Galba, got a troop of armed men together, fell upon him as he was returning from the works, and subjected him to the same treatment as his predecessor in the magistracy. It thenceforth became the received custom in Venice to put out the eyes of deposed Doges; and Galba, who had contrived to usurp the sovereignty, and hold it for eleven years, found himself deposed, blinded, and an exile in the end. The next but one obtained such an amount of popularity that he was enabled to get his son Giovanni associated with him in the ducal dignity, which ran considerable risk of becoming hereditary; for Giovanni had his son, Maurice, similarly nominated, and the descent might have continued unbroken had they conducted themselves with common prudence or decency. But no sooner were they firmly established, than both father and son threw off the mask, and rivalled each other in the worst and most insulting forms of tyranny, cruelty, and profligacy. A conspiracy was formed. The Emperor Charlemagne and the Pope threatened to interfere; and eventually Giovanni and Maurice, having sought safety in flight, Obelerio, the head of the conspiracy, was proclaimed Doge.

This was in 804. The events of the next five years are involved in obscurity. One thing is clear. Pepin, King of the Lombards, either under the pretence of a request for aid from the new Doge or to enforce some real or assumed rights of his own, declared war against the Republic, and waged it with such impetuosity that his fleet and army, after carrying all before them, were only separated from Malamocco, the capital, by a canal. In this emergency, Angelo Participazio, one of those men who are produced by great occasions to mark an era, proposed that the entire population should remove to Rialto, which was separated by a broader arm of the sea from the enemy, and there hold out to the last. No sooner proposed than done. They hastily embarked their all; and when Pepin entered Malamocco, he found it deserted. After losing a large part of his fleet in an ill-advised attack on Rialto, he gave up the enterprise, and Angelo Participazio was elected Doge in recognition of his services, with two tribunes for counsellors.

One of his first acts was to make Rialto the capital, instead of Malamocco or Heraclea, which had each been the seat of Government at intervals. 'There were round Rialto some sixty islets, which

which the Doge connected by bridges. They were soon covered with houses. They were girt with a fortification ; and it was then that this population of fugitives gave to this rising city, which they had just founded in the middle of a morass, the name of Venetia, in memory of the fair countries from which their fathers had been forcibly expatriated. The province has lost its name, and become subject to the new Venice.\* This public-spirited Doge could not resist the temptation of perpetuating the dignity in his race. He had two sons, Justinian and John ; and during the absence of the eldest on an embassy, he, of his own mere motion and authority, made the youngest co-ruler with himself. But so vehement were the remonstrances of the elder, backed by public opinion, that the junior renounced in favour of the senior, who, moreover, contrived to make his own son Angelo a co-partner, so that the Republic was actually subjected to a triumvirate belonging to three generations. The grandson died first, and the son becoming sole Doge by the death of the father in 872, generously shared his power with the brother who had been superseded to make room for him. The most remarkable event in their joint reign was the translation of the body of St. Mark, and the adoption of that saint as the patron saint of the Republic. The original story, as related by the oldest of the Venetian chroniclers, runs thus :

‘ The King of Alexandria, who was building a magnificent palace, had ordered the most precious marbles to be procured, without sparing even the churches. That of Saint Mark was not excepted, and two holy men, Greek priests, who had the care of it, were groaning over the threatened profanation, when two Venetians, captains of vessels in the port, observed and asked the cause of their distress. On ascertaining it, they pressed to be entrusted with the body of Saint Mark, pledging themselves for its befitting reception by their countrymen. The priests refused till the work of demolition began, then they consented ; but it was necessary to keep the transaction secret from the people, who had a great veneration for the remains on account of the daily miracles they worked. The priests carefully cut open the envelope in which the remains were wrapped, and substituted the body of Saint Claudian. Such a perfume was instantly diffused through the Church, and even in the neighbouring places, that the crowd collected about the sacred reliques. There remained the difficulty of conveying them to the ship.

‘ The historians would not be believed if there was not still to be seen in our Church of Saint Mark a marvellous image which attests the fact. They placed the corpse in a large basket covered with herbs and swine’s flesh which the Mussulmans hold in horror, and the

---

\* Daru, vol. i. p. 79. There are 72 islands connected by between 850 and 400 bridges.

bearers were directed to cry *Khawzir* (pork) to all who should ask questions or approach to search. In this manner they reached the vessel. The body was enveloped in the sails and suspended to the mainmast till the moment of departure, for it was necessary to conceal this precious booty from those who might come to clear the vessel in the roads. At last the Venetians quitted the shore full of joy. They were hardly in the open sea when a great storm arose. We are assured that Saint Mark then appeared to the captain and warned him to strike all his sails immediately, lest the ship, driven before the wind, should be wrecked upon the hidden rocks. They owed their safety to this miracle.'

The arrival of these sacred remains was the signal for a succession of fêtes. The people were wild with enthusiasm, the general belief being that the presence of the Saint guaranteed the lasting prosperity of the Republic; and on many trying occasions this belief or superstition, by inspiring confidence, proved a genuine source of strength. Many a time has the cry of *Viva San Marco* revived the drooping courage of the Venetians when powerful States and monarchs were leagued for their destruction, or kept them true to their banner on battle-fields strewn with their dead. Yet far from relying exclusively on their patron saint, they established fêtes and ceremonies in honour of several others; and failing to induce the lawful possessors of the body of a much venerated one, Saint Tarasio, to part with it on reasonable terms, they resorted to the strong measure of stealing it, like the old lady mentioned by Fielding, who stole Tillotson's sermons for the sake of religion.\* The objects of plunder most in request at the sack of Constantinople, in 1204, were the relics; and it is recorded that the Doge Dandolo transmitted (*inter alia*) to Venice a portion of the true Cross, an arm of Saint George, a part of the skull of Saint John the Baptist, the bodies of Saint Luke and Saint Simeon, a phial of the Blood of Christ, a fragment of the pillar at which He was scourged, and a prickle of the Crown of Thorns. The only monuments of art deemed worth transporting were the famous bronze horses.

Another notable epoch in early Venetian history is the grant on which she based her claim to the sovereignty of the Adriatic. In the course of the fierce struggle between Alexander III. and Frederic Barbarossa, the Pope, when his fortunes were at the lowest, took refuge with the Venetians, who, after a vain effort at reconciliation, made common cause with him, and in a naval

\* 'Amongst the pieces of good fortune which increased the reputation of the new Venice in all the Christian world, as well as in the other, was the acquisition of the body of St. Tarasio, stolen from a convent of monks, who refused to sell or part with it.'—*Marin*, quoted by *Daru*.



encounter obtained so signal a victory that the Emperor was compelled to sue for peace and submit to the most humiliating terms. The crowning scene of his degradation has been rendered familiar by the pencil, the chisel, and the pen. Before entering Venice he was met by six cardinals, who received his oath of submission, gave him absolution, and reconciled him with the Church. He was then conducted by a procession of priests to the Place St. Mark, where, at the door of the cathedral, sat his Holiness, arrayed in his pontifical robes, surrounded by cardinals, prelates, representatives of foreign Powers, and high officers of state. The Emperor, as soon as he came into the sacred presence, stripped off his mantle and knelt down before the Pope to kiss his feet. Alexander, intoxicated with his triumph and losing all sense of moderation or generosity, placed his foot on the head or neck of his prostrate enemy, exclaiming, in the words of the Psalmist, '*Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis*' &c. ('Thou shalt tread upon the asp and the basilisk : the lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under foot'). '*Non tibi, sed Petro*' ('Not to thee, but Peter'), cried the outraged and indignant Emperor. '*Et mihi et Petro*' ('To both me and Peter'), rejoined the Pope, with a fresh pressure of his heel.\*

In return for the good offices of Venice on this occasion, the Pope conferred on the Doges the privilege of being preceded by a lighted taper, a sword, a parasol, a chair of state, a cushion of cloth of gold, banners, and two trumpets. In addition to these barren marks of dignity, Alexander presented the reigning Doge, Ziani, with a ring, saying, 'Receive this ring, and with it, as my donation, the dominion of the sea, which you, and your successors, shall annually assert on an appointed day, so that all posterity may understand that the possession of the sea was yours by right of victory, and that it is subject to the rule of the Venetian Republic, as wife to husband.'†

---

\* The spot on which this scene took place was indicated by a marble slab with an inscription in brass :—

'. . . in that temple-porch  
Did Barbarossa fling his mantle off,  
And, kneeling on his neck, received the foot  
Of the proud pontiff.'

Sismondi (following a contemporary chronicler) narrates the interview without any circumstance of insult, and describes it as concluding with the kiss of peace. There are writers who contend that Alexander was never at Venice, and that the Venetians obtained no victory on his behalf. But the weight of evidence adduced by Daru strikes us to be quite conclusive in favour of his version.

† The reported words, which hardly admit of a literal translation, run thus :—'*Hunc annulum accipe et, me auctore, ipsam mare obnoxium tibi redditum; quod tu tuique successores quotannis statuto die servabitis; ut omnis posteritas intelligat maris possessionem victoriæ jure vestram fuisse, atque uti uxorem viro, ita illud imperio reipublicæ Venetæ subjectum.*'

The Republic ruled the Adriatic (so long as she did rule it) much as Britannia rules the waves—by dint of naval superiority. Her right was stoutly resisted by the other maritime Powers of Italy, especially by the Neapolitans and<sup>o</sup> Genoese; and its real nature was virtually admitted by the celebrated reply of the Venetian ambassador to Julius II., when asked where the deed or instrument containing the concession was to be found: ‘On the back of the donation of the domain<sup>o</sup> of St. Peter from Constantine to Pope Sylvester.’

The well-known ceremony of wedding the Adriatic, religiously observed with all its original pomp and splendour during six centuries, was in itself a proclamation and a challenge to the world. It was regularly attended by the papal nuncio and the whole of the diplomatic corps, who, year after year, witnessed the dropping of a sanctified ring into the sea, and heard without a protest the prescriptive accompaniment: *Desponsamus te, mare, in signum veri perpetuique domini* (we espouse thee, sea, in sign of true and perpetual dominion).

‘The spouseless Adriatic mourns her lord,  
And annual marriage now no more renewed;  
The Bucentaur lies rotting unrestor’d,  
Neglected garment of her widowhood.’

The last Bucentaur, a splendidly-gilt and equipped galley, had been repaired or renewed till the identity might have been made a topic of metaphysical dispute like that of Sir John Cutler’s stockings in ‘Martinus Scriblerus;’ but it could hardly have lain rotting when Childe Harold mourned or philosophised over its departed glories, for it was broken up in 1797 by the French.

‘In youth she was all glory,—a new Tyre,  
Her very byeword sprung from victory,  
The “Planter of the Lion,”\* which through fire  
And blood she bore o’er subject earth and sea.’

\* ‘*Plant the Lion*, that is, the Lion of St. Mark, the standard of the Republic, which is the origin of the word pantaloons—*planta-leone*, *pantaleon*, *pantaloen*.’

Historians have failed or omitted to fix the precise period when this ensign of the lion was first adopted by the Republic. But when the two granite columns, still the conspicuous ornaments of the Piazzetta of St. Mark, were erected in or about 1172, a winged lion in bronze was placed on one of them, and a statue of St. Theodore, a patron of earlier standing, on the other. These columns, trophies of a successful raid in the Archipelago, had remained prostrate on the quay for more than fifty years, the engineering difficulty of raising them being pronounced

pronounced insuperable, when a Lombard architect undertook the task, stipulating that he should name his own recompense if he succeeded. Nothing is known of his method except that he wetted the ropes. The recompense he claimed was that games of chance, then prohibited by severe penalties, might be played in the space between the columns. The authorities kept faith, and this anomaly was tolerated for more than four centuries, when it was removed by another and (many will think) a worse. The same locality was devoted to capital executions; so that, rather than break an obsolete pledge, or discontinue a time-honoured custom, these grave and reverend signors established the frequently recurring spectacle of dead or dying malefactors hanging by one leg in the principal square of their city under the windows of their chief magistrate.

Another ceremony, 'The Brides of Venice,' deeply tinged with romance and celebrated in song, carries us back to a still remoter period, when it was the custom for the marriages of the principal citizens to be celebrated together in the patriarchal church of San Pietro di Castello on the eve of the feast of the Purification:—

‘Two and two  
The richest tapestry unrolled before them,  
First came the brides, each in her virgin veil,  
Nor unattended by her bridal maids,  
The two that, step by step, behind her bore  
The small but precious casket that contained  
The dowry and the presents.’

The rite is ending, and the entire congregation are on their knees to receive the blessing, when a band of pirates, who had landed the night before and lain in ambush, rush in, and before the bridegrooms, with their ‘best men,’ had time to take to their weapons—

‘Are gone again—amid no clash of arms  
Bearing away the maidens and the treasures.’

According to Daru and Sismondi, it was the Doge in person who hastily equipped an armament, overtook the pirates, exterminated them to a man, and brought back the brides. Rogers adopts the more romantic version, that they were rescued by the bridegrooms:

‘Not a raft, a plank,  
But on that day was drifting—in an hour  
Half Venice was afloat. But long before,  
Frantic with grief and scorning all controul,  
The youths were gone in a light brigantine,  
Lying at anchor near the arsenal.’

Even

Even the date of the adventure is uncertain. Daru, on a review of the authorities, is clear that it occurred in the tenth century; but Morosini places it in A.D. 668, and it must have occurred when the neighbourhood of the church (now the site of the arsenal) was uninhabited, or the pirates could hardly have landed unobserved.

It was a wonderful advance, allowing even two centuries for its accomplishment, from a state of things in which such an outrage was possible to that in which Venice was able to find means of transport for the whole invading army of the Fourth Crusade, and co-operate in the conquest of the Greek empire on equal terms with the chivalry of Western Europe. The story of this crusade has been admirably told by Sismondi and forms the subject of one of Gibbon's most celebrated chapters. We shall, therefore, merely recall attention to circumstances which have a marked bearing on the position and resources of Venice at the time. Geoffrey de Villehardouin, Marshal of Champagne, the contemporary chronicler of the expedition, relates that he formed one of a deputation of six, empowered to treat with the Venetians for the transport of the troops, estimated at 4500 knights with two mounted esquires each, and 20,000 foot soldiers; in rude numbers, about 30,000 men and 13,000 or 14,000 horses. When it is remembered that the French were unable to transport a numerically inferior force to the Crimea in 1854 without leaving their cavalry behind, some notion may be formed of the marine of a country which could not only supply vessels for such an armament, but fit out an auxiliary force to act with it.\* The terms settled with the Doge, and ratified by acclamation at a grand council or assembly of the people, were four marks per horse and two marks per man, including keep and provisions for nine months, making a sum total of 85,000 marks. It was also stipulated that, on condition of the Venetians joining the expedition with fifty galleys, they should equally share in its fruits.

'Oh, for one hour of blind old Dandolo!' He was past ninety-four when he volunteered to take the command in person, but he makes no allusion to his blindness in the speech in which he mentions his age and feebleness, and doubts have been raised whether he was totally deprived of sight, although one of his descendants, amongst other annalists, states distinctly that his eyes were put out when he was ambassador at Constantinople by the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, who is said to have applied the hot

---

\* 'The French embarked 24,000 infantry and 70 pieces of field artillery; but since they were straitened in their means of sea transport, the number of horses they allotted to each gun was reduced from six to four. The French embarked no cavalry.'—*Kinglake*, 'The Invasion of the Crimea,' vol. ii. p. 141.

iron with his own hands. Villehardouin, also, in his account of the first assault, says: 'Wonderful prowess must now be told. The Duke of Venice, who was old and saw not at all (*goutte ne voyait*), armed at all points on the prow of his galley, the standard of St. Mark before him, was heard crying to his men to put him on shore.' He was landed accordingly, and was carrying all before him, when his victorious course was arrested by the necessity of supporting the French. He was nominated to replace the dethroned Emperor, but declined or was set aside for reasons of policy which the Venetian electors were the first to appreciate, and he died in little more than a year after the completion of the conquest (June 14, 1205), having lived long enough to be proclaimed 'Despot of Romania'—a title annexed to that of Doge, and used by his successors till the middle of the fourteenth century with what Gibbon terms the singular though true addition of 'Lord of one-fourth and a half of the Roman empire.' \*

The difficulty of maintaining such an extent of dominion became so pressing that, according to two chroniclers, a project was actually brought forward by the Doge, in 1223, for abandoning the city and transferring her household gods to Constantinople. His argument in support of this proposal, with those of Angelo Faliero in reply, are reported in the manner of Thucydides; and we are assured that it was only negatived by a majority of one voice, which was termed the voice of Providence. The Venetians wisely abandoned, or granted as fiefs, such of their acquisitions as were not available for ports or commercial depots. 'If, then,' concludes Daru, 'it be asked what was the fruit of this conquest, we must acknowledge that the result was most important for the Venetians, since it assured the splendour of their republic in giving it the empire of the seas; but for Europe this result was the useless loss of many brave men, the burning of Constantinople, the destruction of precious monuments, the fall of an empire, and a dismemberment which facilitated its speedy conquest by barbarians. The only fruit that Europe appears to have derived from this great revolution is the introduction of millet, some grains of which were sent by the Marquis of Montferrat to his Italian States.'

It is not exactly correct to say that the Fourth Crusade assured the empire of the seas to Venice: during more than two hundred years that empire was bravely contested by the Genoese, who more

---

\* *Dominus quartæ partis et dimidiæ imperii Romani.* The correct reading is, *imperii Romanis*—of the empire of Romania. Daru, Sismondi, and the able author of 'Sketches of Venetian History,' have fallen into the same mistake as Gibbon. A quarter of Constantinople, and half of the rest of the imperial dominions, were, in fact, allotted to Venice.

than once reduced the Venetians to the same humiliating position in which the English were placed by the Dutch when Van Tromp sailed up the Thames with the typical broom at his mast-head. When, in the war of Chiozza (1378-1381), the Genoese admiral, Doria, reviewed his fleet whilst waiting for orders, he was received in passing from ship to ship with shouts of '*To Venice! To Venice! Viva San Giorgio!*' Nor was this a vain-glorious boast, like the French cry of '*To Bërlin! To Berlin!*' The Genoese fought their way victoriously to the verge of the chief lagune, when the Doge hastened in person to sue for peace, bringing with him some Genoese prisoners, whom he proposed to deliver without ransom, presenting at the same time a blank paper to be filled up with any terms, provided the independence of the Republic was respected. 'You may take back the prisoners,' was the haughty reply of Doria; 'ere many hours I hope to deliver both them and their companions. By God above, ye Signors of Venice, you must expect no peace from the Lord of Padua or from our Republic till we ourselves have bridled the horses of your St. Mark. Place but the reins once in our hands and we shall know how to keep them quiet for the future.'\*

Driven to desperation, the Venetians made good their defence, and after various alternations of fortune consented to a peace which left them entirely denuded of territory on the mainland. Yet it was Genoa, not Venice, whose decline was accelerated by the contest. The Doge of Venice was bearing himself as bravely as ever amongst monarchs, when the Doge of Genoa was giving up his sceptre and sword to the ambassadors of Charles VI. of France in token of vassalage.

During the interval between the decline of Genoa and the rise of the other maritime Powers, Venice very nearly monopolised the carrying trade between Europe and the East, and had become the greatest commercial emporium in the world. Besides a mercantile marine of more than three thousand vessels, the private property of the citizens, the Government sent annually squadrons of five or six large galleys each to call at all the principal ports within the known range of navigation. In the sixteenth century, the arsenal of Venice contained 16,000 workmen and 40,000 sailors. It could turn out a fleet of 85 galleys at the shortest warning. One of the spectacles with which Henry III. of France was entertained, was the building, launching, and equipping of a galley in one day. At the battle of Lepanto,

---

\* '*Sketches of Venetian History*' (Murray's '*Family Library*'), vol. i. p. 814. The writer relies on the authority of Chinazzo. Daru has divided the speech between Doria and the lord of Padua (Carrara), who was in league with the Genoese.

the Venetians had 134 ships, of which 70 were galleys and 6 galleasses. The galley carried from 15 to 20 guns: the galleasse from 60 to 70 of very heavy calibre. It was the six galleasses that decided the battle. So overpowering did the Venetians esteem this class of vessel that the captain's instructions were not to decline an engagement with 25 ordinary ships of war. Their land forces were considerable. The army which they set on foot in 1509, when menaced by the League of Cambrai, amounted to 30,000 foot and 18,000 horse. There were 5000 soldiers on board their Lepanto fleet. The population of the city never amounted to 200,000; and the question arises where they got men enough for fleets, armies, colonies, commerce, and manufactures. The islands supplied sailors; Dalmatia, soldiers. Italy abounded in mercenary troops who flocked to the standard of the most liberal paymasters: high wages lured the best workmen, as high profits attracted and accumulated capital.

The Venetian system was protective and restrictive. They were no believers in free trade, and their duties on exports and imports by foreigners were in effect prohibitory. We are told of a King of Servia, who, on his departure from Venice, was so startled by the sum he was required to pay for export duty on his purchases, that he solicited the citizenship in order to be excused from paying them. As regards the carrying trade of the Adriatic, when the patriarch of Aquila requested permission to import in a ship of his nation a quantity of wine which he had bought at Ancona, the Republic refused, but offered to carry his wine for him gratis. The Venetians had become so necessary to the Italians, that Robert, King of Naples, was obliged to make peace with them, because his subjects declared themselves too impoverished to pay taxes since the Venetians had discontinued their trade. When, towards the end of the sixteenth century, the English began to trade direct with the Levant, the Venetians took alarm, and requested the interference of the French ambassador at Venice, who writes: 'These Signors are excessively displeased that the Queen of England should establish herself in this quarter, since their traffic will be much diminished, as well in the commodities they export as in those they bring back in exchange.'

' Thus did Venice rise,  
Thus flourish, till the unwelcome tidings came,  
That in the Tagus had arrived a fleet  
From India, from the region of the Sun,  
Fragrant with spices—that a way was found,  
A channel opened, and the golden stream  
Turned to enrich another. Then she felt  
Her strength departing.'

This

This is historically true. It was from their ambassador at Lisbon that the Venetians received the first intelligence of the discovery of the new passage (1497), and the arrival round the Cape of Good Hope of vessels loaded with the richest products of the East. 'On hearing this news,' says Cardinal Bembo, 'the Republic saw that the most important branch of her commerce was slipping away. When she learned that the Portuguese were forming establishments on these coasts, and that they, becoming masters of all the merchandise of Asia, would soon deliver them in Europe at a lower rate than those which arrived by the Red Sea, by the Euphrates, or the Tanais, this jealousy was converted into fury.' They soon afterwards received another heavy blow from the Emperor Charles V., who imposed a duty of 25 per cent. on their imports and exports throughout his dominions, and formally closed his ports against them except on condition that they abandoned their direct trades with Africa, and brought to his town of Oran all the merchandise they had to sell to the Moors. In fact, before the end of the sixteenth century, they were no longer able to exert the right of the strongest; they were driven from market after market by the rising maritime Powers of the North; and, jostled between the powerful monarchies into which Europe had settled down, they could only maintain a precarious independence by adroit trimming. The doctrine of the balance of power was thenceforth the sole salvation of the proud Republic till she fell.

We must not forget to mention that the Bank of Venice, which dates from the twelfth century (1157), was by much the oldest establishment of the kind, and that its operations included loans to foreign nations and princes as well as the ordinary business of a national bank. Here, again, its close imitator and rival was Genoa.\* The Jews were permitted to establish a bank at Venice—which, by the way, broke—but their condition was pretty nearly such as it is described by Shakespeare. They were compelled to wear a badge, to pay exceptional taxes, to inhabit a particular quarter, to be shut up in it from sunset to sunrise, and might be spat upon with impunity by a patrician.

The palaces and public buildings show that the patricians of Venice, collectively and individually, were amongst the earliest

---

\* "It is very singular," I replied, "that the mercantile transactions of London citizens should become involved with revolutions and rebellions." "Not at a, man, not at a," returned Mr. Jarvie; "that's a' your silly prejudications. I read whiles in the lang dark nights, and I hae read in 'Baker's Chronicle,' that the merchants o' London could gar the Bank of Genoa break their promise to advance a mighty sum to the King of Spain, whereby the sailing of the Grand Spanish Armada was put off for a hail year."—*Rob Roy*. The Bank of Genoa was established in 1407.



and most munificent patrons of the fine arts. The country seat of the Barbaro family was built by Palladio, and the walls and ceilings were painted in fresco by Paul Veronese. With the exception of Florence, no Italian State did more for the revival and encouragement of learning, literature, and science. Venice was one of the claimants of the invention of printing, and, within a few years after it became known, 160 printing presses were at work in the city alone. Giving her credit for the University of Padua, of which she became mistress in 1405, she could boast of having protected and pensioned Galileo, besides employing Sarpi as her advocate and Bembo as her historiographer: Petrarch was residing at Venice when Boccaccio came to visit him: and although Tasso was born in the kingdom of Naples, he was the son of a Venetian citizen and educated at the Venetian university. Freedom of thought was rigidly proscribed: no political allusion was safe: Dante, banished by Florence, would have been drowned or strangled at Venice; but she was tolerant of religious speculation and permitted no tyranny except her own. Even the Inquisition was kept within bounds; very fortunately for art, as may be collected from one of M. Baschet's discoveries,—the *procès-verbal* of a sitting (July 18, 1573) at which Paul Veronese was interrogated touching one of his pictures of the Last Supper:

'Q. In this picture of the Supper of our Lord, have you painted people?—A. Yes. Q. How many have you painted, and what is each doing?—A. To begin,—Simon, the master of the hotel; then, below him, an upper servant, whom I suppose to have come there for his amusement and to see after the disposition of the table. There are several other figures of which I have no distinct recollection, considering that it is a long time since I painted this picture. Q. What is the meaning of the figure whose nose is bleeding?—A. It is a servant whose nose has been set bleeding by an accident. Q. And those men armed, and dressed in the German fashion, with halberds in their hands?—A. It is here necessary that I should speak a score of words. Q. Speak them.—A. We painters take the same license as the poets and the jesters, and I have represented the halberdiers eating and drinking at the bottom of the staircase, all ready, moreover, to discharge their duty; for it appeared to me becoming and possible that the master of the house, rich and magnificent, as I have been told, should have such attendants. Q. And that one dressed as a buffoon, with a parrot on his wrist,—with what view have you introduced him into the picture?—A. He is there as an ornament, as is customary. Q. Who are those at the table of our Lord?—A. The Twelve Apostles. Q. What is St. Peter, who comes first, doing?—A. He is carving the lamb to be passed to the other part of the table. Q. And the one next to him?—A. He is holding a plate to receive what St. Peter may

may give him. Q. And the third?—A. He is picking his teeth with a fork. Q. Who are really the persons whom you admit to have been at this Supper?—A. I believe there were none besides Christ and his apostles; but when I have a little room left in a picture, I adorn it with figures of invention.'

He escaped with a reprimand and a command to substitute a Madeleine for a dog.

M. Yriarte devotes a chapter to the magnificent reception of Henry III. of France, in June 1574. But he has omitted the detail which most fastened on the imagination of the author of 'Vathek':—

'When Henry III. left Poland to mount the throne of France, he passed through Venice and found the Senate waiting to receive him in their famous square, which by means of an awning stretched from the balustrades of opposite palaces was metamorphosed into a vast saloon, sparkling with artificial stars, and spread with the richest carpets of the east. What a magnificent idea! The ancient Romans in the zenith of power and luxury never conceived a greater. It is to them, however, that the Venetians are indebted for the hint, since we read of the Coliseum and Pompey's theatre being sometimes covered with transparent canvas to defend the spectators from the heat or sudden rain, and to tint the scene with soft agreeable colours.'\*

Whatever may have been the case in more modern times, the early prosperity of Venice was in no respect owing to her form of government, which was of the rudest and most fluctuating kind. 'We have now,' says Daru, arriving at 1172, 'run over the history of fifty Doges. We have seen five abdicate, nine exiled or deposed, five banished with their eyes put out, and five massacred. Thus nineteen of these princes had been driven from their thrones by violence. If there was ample room for complaints of their abuse of their power, there was no less subject for regret and shame at the manner in which it had been overthrown.' The early constitution of Venice might have been described, like that of Russia, as a monarchy tempered by assassination. The method of election was no more subjected to fixed rules than the authority conferred by it. Some Doges, as we have seen, nominated their successors. Others were elected by a voluntary assembly of the people. At the election of Domenico Silvo by the people on the shore of San Nicolò del Lido, 1069, a great number came armed in their boats and, without landing, began shouting vociferously '*Vogliamo il Silvo, e lo approviamo*—(We will have Silvo, and we approve of him). When the election was not the direct act of the people, the Doge was presented for popular approval in St.

---

\* 'Italy,' &c. By the author of 'Vathek' (Beckford), vol. i. p. 113.

Mark's. It is passing strange, therefore, to find M. Yriarte so carried away by enthusiasm for his subject as to exclaim : ' We may almost say that, for the Venetians, the age of indispensable struggles, of barbarism, of inevitable disorders, has not existed. They will be a people almost without transition, and one of the most powerful in the world. Their magistracies will be already instituted, whilst the greater part of the people of Europe are still sunk in barbarism. Their collection of laws will give evidence from the first of their love of justice, and their rapid instinct of civilisation.'

The first of their laws for regulating the authority of the Doge was that of 1032, which assigned him two counsellors, whose assent was necessary to his acts, and required him on important occasions to convoke such of the citizens as he might think proper to deliberate on the interests of the State. These were called the *pregadi*. The nomination being discretionary with the Doge, they exercised no practical control : and, according to Sismondi, the formation of a much more important body, of that which was to assume the sovereignty and contain the whole Republic in itself, was posterior by one hundred years to this first limitation of the ducal authority. ' After the unfortunate expedition of the Doge Vital Micheli, after he had exposed his fleet to contagion and lost the flower of his soldiers, a sedition broke out against him on his return, and he was killed by a plebeian. An interregnum of six months preceded the election of his successor ; and this time was employed in laying the foundations of a government which should prevent the public weal from being again endangered by the misconduct of one man. Without abolishing the assemblies, a Council of 480 members was formed and invested (conjointly with the Doge) with the entire sovereignty.\*

They were elected annually by twelve tribunes or electors representing the six sections or divisions of the city, who were originally chosen by the people ; but the Grand Council first usurped the right of choosing their own electors, and then passed a succession of decrees, the general effect of which was to render ineligible all who, or whose ancestors, had not already sat in it. The change was gradual. The first Council was elected in 1172 : the decree called ' The Closing of the Great Council,' was passed in 1296 ; and this was followed up in 1319 by one making the privilege personal and hereditary ; it being, moreover, provided that the son might take his seat in the lifetime of the father on attaining his twenty-fifth

---

\* ' Histoire des Rép. Ital.,' vol. ii. p. 345.

year. A register was then opened in which the names of the duly qualified persons were enrolled. This was the famous Golden Book, *Il Libro d'Oro*, which, at its commencement, was simply a list of the governing body; and included some who were not nobly born, whilst excluding others whose influence or position was inferior to their birth. Indeed, invidious distinctions were sedulously discountenanced, and wholesale additions to the privileged body were occasionally made without regard to pedigree or blood. When the Republic was hard pressed for money, inscriptions in the Golden Book were sold at the current price of 100,000 ducats; and amongst the thirty heads of families who were admitted after the war of Chiozza, in 1381, as a reward for their services or patriotic sacrifices, we find artisans, wine-merchants, grocers, and apothecaries. Illustrious foreigners were admitted, as they are made free of a corporation amongst us. The form of address to the new member was: *Te civem nostrum creamus*. The honour was not disdained even by crowned heads. Henry IV.'s application for it was accepted as a compliment. Not so that of the Pope Gregory XIII. for one of his illegitimate sons, who passed for a nephew. After long deliberation, he was admitted as a near relative (*strettoparente*) of his Holiness. There was always a wide difference between the members of the Great Council in point of rank: the bearers of historic names, like *gli Elettorali*, being invested with a prestige which secured them a priority in high office as well as social precedence; but all equally belonged to the privileged class: to that aristocracy whose iron yoke, once riveted, neither Doge nor people were ever able to shake off.\*

In all the other Italian republics, the nobles had been contemporaneously losing ground. 'During the last twenty years of the thirteenth century,' says Sismondi, 'not only were they compelled to share the prerogatives they desired to monopolise: they were absolutely and completely stripped of them. The Priors of Florence were all required to belong to a trade or calling, and exercise it personally. The nine Signors and defenders of the community of Sienna must be merchants and people of the middle class.' 'At Pistoia,' says Daru, 'the nobles were permanently disqualified for office, and the penalty of the non-noble who incurred degradation was to be inscribed in the book of nobility.' At Modena there was a register, called the Book of the Nobles, in which all the *gentlemen* (in the continental sense) were inscribed, along with some of the *roturier* class whom the tribunals had associated with them as guilty of the same dis-

\* The original *Libro d'Oro* was publicly burned in 1797, but extracts, registers, and other documents are extant, from which its contents might be ascertained.

orders ; and all the inscribed were disqualified for office in the lump. The same legislation was afterwards carried out at Bologna, Padua, Brescia, Pisa, Genoa, and in all the free cities.\* The popular hatred, embittered by fear, was especially directed against the feudal or territorial nobility, which never existed in Venice ; and the success of the Venetian aristocracy in constituting themselves the sole governing body, was mainly owing to the fact that they were, in the first instance, a genuine and (so to speak) natural aristocracy, comprising nearly all the citizens or heads of families distinguished by birth, public services, personal influence or hereditary wealth. On finding that some families with undeniable claims had been excluded, the Council speedily corrected the error by admitting them.

Prior to the closing of the Council, the principal check on the Doge was the *Promisso Ducale*, or Coronation Oath. To increase its restrictive force, and watch over its observance, the Council named five of their own body, called 'Correctors,' whose general instructions were to see 'that the Doges are the chiefs of the Republic, and not its masters or its tyrants.' They ended by making the Doges its passive instruments or slaves. The Doge was forbidden to open any letter or despatch except in the presence of a certain number of counsellors, or to write any letter, public or private, without showing it to them. He was liable to a penalty of 100 ducats if he left the city for an hour : if his health required change of residence, they were to designate the place to which he might go, and fix the time he might remain. It was provided in 1462 that, if the ambassadors on the day of their reception attempted to touch on any question of State, he must turn the conversation, and in 1521—apropos of some real or alleged indiscretion of Antonio Grimaldi—that the Doge must always confine himself to evasive expressions or words of mere courtesy in the reception of ambassadors. His sons were excluded from taking any active part in the Council or filling any of the principal offices. The officers attached to his person were similarly excluded from public employments during his reign, and for one year afterwards. The title of Monsignore was proscribed ; and he was to suffer no one to bend the knee to him or to kiss his hand. His portrait was not to be hung up in the ducal palace, nor his armorial bearings to figure on public buildings or standards. He was forbidden to marry a foreigner, or to possess fiefs beyond the limits of the State. In 1400, the correctors enacted :—

'The advocates of the Commune may prosecute the chief of the

---

\* Sismondi, 'Hist. des Rép. Ital.' vol. iii. pp. 164–165. Daru, vol. i. pp. 505–506.

State either for a public act or an act of his private life. In the council held by the college, the Doge can never oppose the conclusions of the advocates of the Commune.'

The Doges were paid quarterly. Jacopo Tiepolo, 1229–1249, received eight hundred lire *veneti*; Reniere Zeno, 1253–1268, two thousand; Giovanni Dandolo, 1280–1289, three thousand. They had also rents from lands specially assigned for their personal expenses, and other tributary payments. 'In 1329,' adds M. Yriarte (from whom we copy these figures) 'when all this was computed and the times had grown more expensive, the Grand Council fixed the annual appointments at 5200 lire. This figure was maintained down to the fall of the Republic. Till 1312 the "Book of Ducal Promises" contains the clause regulating the appointments; but, dating from this epoch, the chapter relating to the emoluments is suppressed.'

Besides the narrowest scrutiny into the conduct of the Doge in his lifetime, a sort of coroner's inquest was held over his body after death by commissaries appointed by the Council to inquire how he had managed his fortune, whether he had contracted debts or injured the interests of any one; in which case they acted as liquidators. 'There was a law requiring the Chief of the State to pay within eight days for the objects of which he had become the purchaser, but this was almost always a dead letter. The greater part of the inquisitions proved that the Doges had ruined themselves in the service of the State. Twice only the Council were on the point of refusing the public honours to the deceased. Marco Fornarini (1762–1763) who was only a year in power, was so magnificent that he died insolvent; and Paolo Raineri (1779–1789), who had made an immense fortune at Constantinople, left debts to the amount of six millions of ducats. But both instances occurred when the restrictions on expenditure had also become a dead letter.'

No qualified person could refuse the Dogeship or resign it without the permission of the Council. In 1368 Andrea Contarini, being elected in spite of his earnest entreaties to be excused, fled to Padua, and sought refuge with an obscure dependant. The Senate instantly took the decisive step of notifying to him that he must return and accept the office, or expect to see his property confiscated, his name stigmatised, and himself declared a traitor to his country. He came back, submitted to his elevation, and occupied the ducal throne during fifteen years.

Yet the form of election, with its multiplicity of checks, would justify an assumption that the Dogeship was the grand object of ambition, to obtain which all sorts of undue influences would be employed. Thirty members of the Grand Council, chosen  
by

by lot, were reduced by lot to nine. The nine chose forty provisional electors, who were similarly reduced to twelve. The twelve chose twenty-five, who were again reduced to nine. Each of these nine proposed five, making a new list of forty-five, which was reduced to eleven; and these eleven produced a list of forty-one, who were to be the definitive electors after each had been submitted to the Grand Council. If any one failed to obtain the 'absolute majority of suffrages, the eleven were to name another, and so on. When forty-one were approved, they passed into an apartment in which they were shut up till they had elected a Doge. But, unlike our English jury in an analogous position, they were magnificently regaled at the expense of the public: everything they chose to call for was supplied; and, to prevent the semblance of bribery, any article called for by one was scrupulously supplied to the rest. Thus an elector having asked for a rosary, forty-one rosaries were sent in; and another having asked for 'Æsop's Fables,' the whole city was ransacked till forty-one copies were procured. In 1709 the conclave sate for thirteen days, and the expenses amounted to 59,325 lire (francs); in 1789 the expenses of the same number of electors for six days came to 378,387 lire. Corruption was evidently undermining the fabric which was so speedily to be overthrown by force.

The numbers, seldom under 1200, of the Great Council unfitted it for the direct exercise of its executive powers, which therefore were delegated to the Senate, a body composed of 120 members of the Council, the Doge, the Council of Ten, the judges, and other high officials invested with executive or administrative authority.\* This constituted the real government, which acted independently of the Great Council, except when new taxes were to be imposed.

We now come to the most remarkable of Venetian institutions, the Council of Ten, which was the unpremeditated result of exceptional events, instead of being the masterpiece of Machiavelian policy which it passes for. The closing of the Great Council was not effected without producing a good deal of popular indignation, besides exciting the jealousy of the excluded nobles; and the Doge, Pierre Gradenigo, the principal author of the new system, was marked out as the peculiar object of their machinations. Overthrow him, and they would regain the rights and liberties of which they had been robbed. One

---

\* St. Didier traces the Senate to the *Pregadi*, citizens specially requested to advise the Doge on occasion. M. Baschet estimates the average number of regular members at 220, without including the functionaries who might attend without taking part in their deliberations.

conspiracy formed by a democratic leader, Marin Bocconio, whilst the obnoxious changes were still in progress, was discovered before the time fixed for its execution, and all engaged in it, or suspected, were arrested, put to the question, and drowned or strangled off-hand. Another, of a later date, proved much more formidable. The ringleaders were patricians; the chief was Tiepolo, who counted two Doges amongst his ancestors, and the numbers engaged were large enough to contend with the whole armed force at the disposal of the State. The opposing factions were fighting hand-to-hand on the place of Saint Mark, each waving the same standard and shouting the same cry, when the Doge came upon the scene with fresh troops, which ought to have been encountered by Tiepolo, who accidentally arrived too late to co-operate with his friends. The force he brought with him was strong enough to enable him to make good his retreat to Rialto, where, having secured the boats and broken down the bridges, he held out for some days: when, despairing of the enterprise, he embarked and took refuge beyond the territories of the Republic.

The Doge, who had saved the State by his courage and energy, declared that he only heard of the plot in the course of the night preceding the execution; yet it had been maturing for months; there had been frequent meetings of the conspirators, whose speeches are reported; application had been made to Padua for help, and several hundred persons of all ranks must have been more or less cognizant of what was meditated. The sense of insecurity was such that a kind of dictatorship was created by the nomination of ten members of the Council charged to watch over the safety of the State. 'It was armed with all the means, emancipated from all the forms, relieved from all responsibility, and held all heads dependent upon its pleasure.' It is true that it was to last only ten days, then ten more, then twenty, then two months; but it was prorogued six times successively for the same time. At the end of one year, it was confirmed for five. Then it found itself strong enough to declare the continuance of its authority for ten years more. At last, in 1325, this terrible magistracy was declared perpetual. What it had done to prolong its duration, it did to extend its attributions. Instituted simply to take cognizance of crimes against the State, it usurped the entire administration.

Giving substantially the same account of it as Daru, Sismondi says that it established despotism, and preserved nothing of liberty but the name; and Hallam, after describing the uncontrolled authority of the Ten in the conduct of affairs, remarks that they were chiefly known as an arbitrary and inquisitorial tribunal,



tribunal, the standing tyranny of Venice. 'Excluding the regular court of criminal judicature, not only from the investigation of treasonable charges, but of several other crimes of magnitude, they inquired, they judged, they punished, according to what they called reason of State. The public eye never penetrated the mystery of their proceedings; the accused was sometimes not heard, never confronted with witnesses: the condemnation was secret as the inquiry, the punishment undivulged like both.'\* Yet M. Baschet insists on treating the traditional impression of the Council of Ten as a vulgar prejudice, and thinks he has made out a defence for it by showing that it was steadily upheld by the Great Council on whose authority it had encroached. But this shows merely that the instinct of self-preservation was stronger in the Venetian oligarchy than the love of freedom or the hatred of injustice; and after saying that the State Inquisitors were never anything more than the delegates (*mandataires*) of the Council of Ten, he adds:—

'Their ministry has always been considered with terror, not without reason. The most absolute mystery prevailed in their procedure. The means at their disposal were unlimited, and the reason of State led to the most terrible expedients as well as to the most cruel necessities. Very much dreaded by the patricians, this tribunal was more than once attacked by them with vehement eloquence in the bosom of the Great Council. The most opposite views were entertained. Some wished its destruction, others its preservation. For some it was the tyranny in the Republic, for others the safe-guard. The great debates of March 1762 have continued memorable. The numbers of votes which were the result placed the Conservative party in the right, and it only fell with the Republic.'

The Council of Ten consisted, in reality, of seventeen: ten members of the Great Council, the Doge, and his Privy Council of six. The ten were chosen by a complicated system of ballot: they were elected for a year, and could not be re-elected. Their first duty was to elect three chiefs. The Inquisitors, three in number, were chosen two amongst the Ten, one amongst the councillors of the Doge. The two were robed in black, and called the Black Inquisitors; the third in red, and called the Red Inquisitor. They did not act in their own name, nor was the very existence of the tribunal manifested by any outward or visible sign. Their summonses and orders of arrest were signed by one of the regular magistrates. An important part of the business at each meeting of the Council of Ten or the Inquisitors was the examination of the denunciations and complaints found

\* 'View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages,' chap. iii. part 2.

in the Lion's Mouth—M. Daru says there were several of these receptacles—and M. Baschet is confident that the greatest caution was observed in dealing with them, especially when they were anonymous, as, no doubt, the greater part of them were. M. Cantu, who takes the same indulgent view of their proceedings as M. Baschet, cites a decree of September 11, 1462, requiring the Chiefs to lay the grounds of complaint before the Council within three days, but neutralises it by a later document, showing that the accused were often kept in prison for months and years without any proceedings being taken.\*

The accused was never confronted with the witnesses, who were sworn to secrecy. 'Certain interrogatories were administered in the dark. Was this to inspire terror in the accused, or to prevent his being troubled by the sight of his judges?'† M. Baschet is silent as to interrogatories on the rack. Of punishments, he says: 'Most of them were terrible; some moderate.' Amongst the first, the obscure prison, hanging between the columns of St. Mark, cutting off the hand, beheading, strangling. The most dreadful was the punishment of death mysteriously inflicted and thus pronounced: 'That this night the condemned . . . be conducted to the Canal Orfano,‡ where, his hands being tied and the body weighted, he shall be thrown in by an officer of justice, and that he die there.' No net was to be cast in this canal under penalty of death; and if any one exhibited any troublesome curiosity touching the fate of a missing friend, the chances were that he would share the same fate. The recorded sentences found in the Archives are silent as to the crime, e.g.:—

'Considering what has just been read in this Council, and for reasons of State which can be amply justified, the Chiefs of this Council provide that, with the greatest and most secret precautions, the Turk Soliman be deprived of life either by poison or by drowning.'

The execution of this judgment is proved by a memorandum:—

'The Chief Captain has vouched for the execution of the annexed order, and the men employed are those whose names are here inscribed. He has given them on the part of the Chiefs of the Council the severest admonition never at any time to reveal this execution under penalty of death.'

It appears from another document that the Turk Soliman

---

\* 'Histoire des Italiens.' Par M. César Cantu. Paris, 1861. Vol. x. p. 29.

† In the torture chamber of Ratisbon is still shown the lattice screen behind which the judge or judges sat during the interrogatory.

‡ A deep channel behind the island of S. Giorgio Maggiore.

was drowned. From a document, dated January 15th, 1595, it appears that the Captain Cesar Capuzzimadi had received a hundred ducats from the Venetian Resident at Milan. Then, in less than a month, February 9th, there is a decree of the Ten :—

‘ That to-morrow morning, Captain Cesar Capuzzimadi, Albanian, when he shall present himself before the Chiefs of the Council, be arrested, and that for things which have just been said and read.’

On the 15th the Captain is required to produce his defence, which was put to the vote on the 19th, when sentence was passed by fifteen to two :—

‘ It is our will that in the night of Wednesday to Tuesday, which will be the 22nd of the current month, he be strangled in his prison, as secretly as possible, and that his body be buried with the greatest secrecy also by the care of the Chiefs.’

The decrees and regulations of the Ten touching State matters were deposited in the Secret Chancery, and carefully guarded. ‘ Greater precautions,’ observes M. Baschet, ‘ could not be taken to secure the darkest political adventure from indiscretion. The Doge could not enter unattended. Giovanni Rossi relates that a common man used to be chosen as material guardian of these Archives. The last known was Giovanni Polacco, who discharged his duty to perfection. The Government, according to others, were in the habit of seeking out some one who, though faithful and judicious, was grossly ignorant, and who, for greater security, could neither read nor write. The story goes that one day some senator, seeing Polacco writing very near the *Secreta*, expressed the utmost astonishment, and said to him, ‘ What! you know how to write!’ To which the guardian with ready wit replied, ‘ No, Excellence, I am drawing.’

A decree of August 8, 1594, shows how the State Inquisitors were employed by the Ten :—

‘ That plenary powers be given to the Inquisitors to find a person who by some prudent means can take away the life of Frà Cipriano of Lucca.’

Fra Cipriano was a Venetian monk, who had taken refuge in the Austrian dominions, and was constantly intriguing against the Republic. That poison was frequently employed by the agents of the tribunal in obedience to its orders, and even supplied to them, is beyond dispute. A register has been found in the Archives, entitled *Secreta Secretissima del Consiglio dei Dièci*, containing two documents : one, dated December 14, 1518, relating to a Brother John of Ragusa, who proposes with the greatest secrecy to the three Chiefs ‘ some admirable methods  
of

of mysteriously causing death :’ the other, April 27, 1527, showing that the Council of Ten had resolved to remove the Constable Duc de Bourbon by poison, if he had not saved them the trouble by getting killed in the assault of Rome.

On the 10th March, 1630, Pier Antonio, Venetian Resident at Florence, writes :—

‘Most excellent and most revered Signors,—I have at length obtained with the greatest secrecy the recipes of two sorts of very potent poison from a person highly skilled in chemistry, who has copies of the greater part of the secrets of the deceased Don Antonio Medici, famous in the same profession, amongst which secrets are these recipes. I transmit them for greater circumspection to the ordinary address of your secretary, under the description of salubrious essences required by him.’

So late as 1767, the Proveditor-General of Dalmatia received a packet of poison from the Council of Ten, with directions for its secret and cautious use in ridding them and the world of a person reported ‘dangerous.’

According to the written statutes of the Inquisitors, if a person had committed any action that it was inconvenient to punish juridically, he was to be poisoned. The patrician who spoke, however slightly, against the Government, was to be admonished twice, and the third time drowned as incorrigible. The vigilance and severity of the tribunal extended over the members of the Council, the Doge, the Inquisitors themselves : only it was provided that such criminals should be proceeded against with the deepest mystery, and that, in case of condemnation to death, poison should be preferred to any other means.

Moore, apostrophising Venice in ‘Rhymes on the Road,’ exclaims :

‘Thy perfidy, still worse than ought,  
Thine own unblushing Sarpi taught.’

He refers to a set of Maxims drawn up in 1615 by the famous Fra Paolo for the guidance of the Venetian Government, some of which for atrocity throw the ‘Prince’ of Machiavel into the shade, *e. g.* :—

‘Those who in the municipal councils shall show themselves either bolder or more devoted to the interests of the people must be destroyed or gained at any price. Lastly, if any party leaders are found in the provinces, they must be exterminated under some pretext or another, *but there must be no recourse to ordinary justice. Let poison do the work of the executioner. This is less odious and more profitable.*’

The axioms from which he starts are these :—

‘The

‘The greatest act of justice the Prince can perform is to maintain himself.’

‘I term *justice* every thing that contributes to the maintenance of the State.’

Machiavel relates that, on the return of a Venetian squadron, a conflict arose between the people and the crews. The interference of the magistrates had proved nugatory, when a retired officer, who was much respected by the sailors, succeeded in calming the tumult. The influence of which he had given so marked a proof became a subject of alarm: a short time afterwards he was arrested and carried to a prison, where he died. A Cornaro was sent to prison for distributing corn to the poor during a famine, his charity being attributed to ambitious views. What can be said of a Government under which public or private virtue was a crime?

A foreigner of distinction, having had his pocket picked, indulged in some harsh expressions against the police. Some days afterwards he was quitting Venice, when his gondola was stopped, and he was requested to step into another. ‘Monsieur,’ said a grave personage, ‘are you not the Prince de Craon?’—‘Yes.’ ‘Were you not robbed last Friday?’—‘Yes.’ ‘Of what sum?’—‘Five hundred ducats.’ ‘Where were they?’—‘In a green purse.’ ‘And do you suspect any one of this robbery?’—‘A valet de place.’ ‘Should you recognise him?’—‘Without doubt.’ Then the interrogator pushes aside a dirty cloak, discovers a dead man holding a green purse in his hand, and adds, ‘You see, Sir, that justice has been done: there is your money; take it, and remember that a prudent man never sets foot again in a country where he has underrated the wisdom of the Government.’

A Genevese painter, working in a church at Venice, had a quarrel with two Frenchmen, who began abusing the Government. The next day he was summoned before the Inquisitors, and on being asked if he should recognise the persons with whom he had quarrelled, he replied in the affirmative, protesting that he had said nothing but what was in honour of the Signory. A curtain is drawn, and he sees the two Frenchmen with the marks of strangulation round their necks. He is sent away half dead with fright, with the injunction to speak neither good nor evil of the Government: ‘We have no need of your apologies, and to approve us is to judge.’ The religious orders were allowed no exemption. Some monks having been accused of irregularities towards their female penitents, their convent was first made acquainted with their crime, their trial, and their execution, when their bodies were brought to be interred.

In

In 'Marino Faliero' and 'The Two Foscari,' Lord Byron has faithfully dramatised two episodes of Venetian history which strikingly illustrate the irresistible power and the stern unrelenting spirit of the tribunal. One chief magistrate, full of years and honours, is proclaimed a traitor and executed on the steps of his own palace: another dies degraded and broken-hearted, after being thrice compelled to gaze on a beloved son writhing on the rack. Yet the wheels of the State machinery revolve without a check, and no more account is made of a deposed or decapitated Doge than of a strangled mechanic or a missing gondolier. Another great poet, Manzoni, has portrayed with equal truth and force the manner in which the Republic managed to combine perfidy and ingratitude with cruelty, in their treatment of his hero, one of the most renowned soldiers of Italy, who had brought victory to their side.\*

Bearing these things in mind, it is anything but reassuring to be told by M. Baschet that the average number of prisoners was small. 'The examination of the *Informazioni*, which the secretary presented at the end of every year, enables us to establish the truth as to the number of prisoners of the Inquisitors. We see how restricted was the number if, with these authentic pieces before our eyes, we are willing to seek and accept the truth. It rarely happened that the prisons called *pozzi* (the wells), and those called *piombi* (under the leads), were all occupied at the same time. In 1717 there is a single prisoner under the leads, two in the wells, and four in the *camerotti*. . . . The more we penetrate into the history of this extraordinary tribunal, the more are we convinced that it was still more appalling by the really impenetrable mystery with which it surrounded itself than terrible by its acts.'

We arrive at a diametrically opposite conclusion. It was an inevitable result of this impenetrable mystery that the details of many current stories or traditions should be disproved by the Archives, when brought to light and carefully collated; but, on the other hand, these Archives teem with proofs of the guiding spirit and detestable character of the tribunal: nor can we place implicit faith in their secretaries as to the facts. When Howard visited the Venetian prisons in 1778, he found between three and

---

\* '*Il Conte di Carmagnola. Tragedia.*' Manzoni makes no allusion to the torture inflicted on Carmagnola, deeming it probably too revolting for dramatic treatment. He states in his preface that the death of Carmagnola proved the salvation of the Republic in the way the Venetians least anticipated. Their first suspicion of the secret League of Cambray was excited by the report of an agent at Milan, to the effect that a Piedmontese, known to be in communication with the French Government, was going about saying that the time had come when the death of his countryman Carmagnola would be amply avenged.

four hundred persons confined in them, some of whom told him they would have preferred the galleys for life. When M. Cantu states that only one prisoner was found when the prisons were thrown or broken open in 1797, he proves too much. How many were found in the Bastille? But granted the occasional paucity of prisoners, may not the summary methods of gaol delivery pursued by the Inquisitors account for this supposed anomaly?

‘ Few houses of the size were better filled,  
 Though many came and left it in an hour,  
 Most nights—so said the good old Nicoli—  
 For three and thirty years his uncle kept  
 The water-gate below, but seldom spoke  
 Though much was on his mind—most nights arrived  
 The prison boat—that boat with many oars,  
 And bore away as to the Lower World  
 Disburdening in the Canal Orfano,  
 That drowning place where never net was thrown,  
 Summer or winter, death the penalty.’

The Ten and the Inquisitors uniformly acted on the maxim that dead men tell no tales. To demonstrate their cold-hearted calculated cruelty and utter recklessness of proof we should be content to rely on the affair on which the ‘ Venice Preserved ’ of Otway is based. On the 25th of May, 1618, Sir Henry Wotton, then English Ambassador at Venice, writes : ‘ The whole town is here at present in horror and confusion upon the discovery of a foul and fearful conspiracy of the French against this State ; whereof no less than thirty have already suffered very condign punishment, between men strangled in prison, drowned in the silence of the night, and hanged in public ; and yet the bottom is invisible.’ And so it remained, and remains still ; nor is Muratori far wrong in asserting that nothing is clear except the fact that several hundreds of suspected persons were tortured and put to death. The supposed object of the alleged conspiracy—projected, it was said, by the Duke d’Ossuna, Spanish Viceroy of Naples, in concert with the Marquis of Bedemar, Spanish Ambassador at Venice—was neither more nor less than to seduce the foreign troops in the pay of the Republic, set fire to the arsenal, upset the government, and reduce the entire State under subjection to Spain. The first information was obtained from one Jacques Pierre, who had begun life as a pirate, and after being for some time in the service of the Duke d’Ossuna, had fled from Naples and obtained employment in some subordinate office in the arsenal. The notes or minutes of his disclosures, written by him in French, were translated at his request  
 into

into Italian by a friend named Renault, with the view of their being laid before the Council. He declared himself the main agent in the plot, and represented his quitting the Duke's service as an overt act.

The first arrests were made on the unsupported evidence of this man, and we know of no other direct or indirect proofs but confessions and accusations extorted by the rack, or such as the Lion's Mouth was pretty sure to supply in such a contingency. Daru, who has devoted more than a hundred pages to the elucidation of the mystery, comes to the conclusion that the conspiracy was a myth, and that the executions were a blind to conceal from Spain a secret understanding between the Duke, the Court of France, and the Signory ; nor does the terrible charge against the Venetian authorities, implied in this conclusion, startle him, although the arrests and executions extended over ten months, and he dwells on the paucity of information 'collected from many hundred accused, who all underwent the question, and of whom one only was fortunate enough to make his judges pause on his condemnation.' The atrocities committed to keep the whole transaction involved in darkness may be inferred from the so-called justificatory Report of the Ten and the recorded Procedure :—

'A long discussion took place whether they should spare the life of Captain Brushart, but for many considerations, and in pursuance of the line they had taken to put to death all those who were implicated in this affair, he was strangled on the night of St. Peter and St. Paul, which agrees with the 29th June ; fifty of his co-accused were strangled, and a still greater number secretly buried.

'Two artificers, brothers, accused of having held communication with Pierre, were subjected to the torture during several hours ; the one persisted in his denial, the other merely repeated his confessions ; both were hanged the next day, and twenty-nine prisoners were drowned the same night in the Canal Orfano, "*pour ne point ébruiter l'affaire.*"'

These are the very words of the Report. Besides those put to death in the city, two hundred and sixty officers and soldiers, arrested in the towns of the mainland, perished by the hands of the executioner. An artisan, who happened to be at Zara, was killed by shots from an arquebus, together with a soldier and a child who were attending on him. Pierre, who was with the fleet, was flung into the sea, the officer being especially enjoined not to give him time for confession, so that, according to the prevalent belief, his soul might perish with his body. Forty-five men, suspected of having had relations with him, were drowned without noise (*sans bruit*). Renault, a notorious gambler and drunkard, was seven times interrogated on the rack without uttering any-



thing but imprecations against his judges, who, finding nothing more to be got from him, ordered him to be strangled in prison, and then exposed on the gibbet hanging by one leg. Antoine Jaffier was a French captain, who had vaguely deposed to a communication with Pierre. He received 4000 sequins as a reward, and was ordered to quit the Venetian territory within three days; but in passing through Brescia, he was arrested for having held communications with French officers, brought back to Venice, and drowned. Another witness, to whom a pension of 50 ducats per month and a gratification of 300 ducats had been assigned, was ordered to repair to Candia, where, immediately on his arrival, he was killed in a quarrel forced on him, *querelle d'Allemand* as it is termed.

‘Thus, accused, accusers, all were judged equally guilty—those who had spontaneously given the first information, and those who later revealed a plot which the Government knew already, and those who owned themselves accomplices in a conspiracy in which they had been initiated without knowing the real object, and those who denied having had anything to do with it—all, without exception, perished, that no witness might remain who could depose to the circumstances. Five months afterwards the Doge, accompanied by all the nobles, might be seen going to the cathedral of Saint Mark to offer solemn thanksgivings to Providence.’\*

We need hardly add that there is little in Otway’s play corresponding with the actual characters or occurrences besides the names, but he has partially followed the popular, though inaccurate, version of St. Real.

• It not unfrequently happens that an individual case of cruelty or injustice makes more impression than an indiscriminate mass of cases, and it so happened that the Venetians, who had remained quiet during these wholesale tortures and executions, were suddenly aroused to a sense of the common danger by the untimely fate of one man. Antonio Foscarini had been four years ambassador to England, after filling the same dignity in France, when he was secretly accused by his secretary of having revealed the despatches of the Signory to foreign ambassadors. He arrived in Venice in March 1616; was arrested and interrogated, and remained in prison till July 1618, when he was declared innocent, and set at liberty. He lays the Relations of his two embassies before the Senate, of which he subsequently becomes a member. All of a sudden he is denounced in April 1622, as having had a mysterious understanding with the Nuncio

---

\* Daru, liv. xxxi

and other Ministers in the house inhabited by Lady Arundel at Venice; he is arrested on the 8th, called before the Inquisitors, condemned on the 20th, and strangled in prison on the 21st. On the 20th of the following August, his accusers were re-examined, admitted the falsehood of the charge, and were executed. 'These formidable judges,' says M. Baschet, 'who, however, might have relied on public policy and reasons of State, as their justification, did not keep silence, and by an admirable decree, that all magistrates, present and to come, should see written in letters of gold on the wall of the place where they sit, re-established in the face of the world the honour and reputation of the citizen whom, in their soul and conscience, under the weight of proofs that appeared overwhelming, they had condemned to the most infamous as well as most cruel of punishments.'

A widely different account of their conduct is given by Sir Henry Wotton, who professes to have made 'research of the whole proceeding, that his Majesty (James I.) may have a more due information of this rare and unfortunate example.' The proofs that appeared overwhelming, consisted of the depositions of three informers, to the effect that Foscarini had been in secret communication with the Spanish secretary, to whom no reference was made till after the execution. It was his positive denial and circumstantial disproof that led to the conviction of the informers; and the application of Foscarini's family for a revision of the sentence was actually refused on the ground that the false witnesses, being convicted of falsehood, were incompetent. But their confession preparatory to their final plunge into the canal being obtained through the priest, and published, the Council of Ten, after a delay of nearly five months, issued this hypocritical decree:—'Since the providence of our Lord God, by means truly miraculous and inscrutable to the human understanding, has brought to pass that the very authors and ministers of the falsehood and impostures fabricated against our late beloved noble, Antonio Foscarini, &c., it consorts with the justice and piety of this Council, on whom above all things it is incumbent to protect the honour and reputation of families,' &c. 'Surely,' adds Wotton, 'in the three hundred years that the Decemviral Tribunal hath stood, there was never cast upon it a greater blemish, which is likely to breed no good consequences upon the whole.'

The exposure having failed to correct the abuse, a proposal for abolishing the tribunal, or modifying its powers, was brought before the Great Council, and led to a series of animated debates, at one of which several of the members appeared, contrary to a standing regulation, in arms. Things came to such a pass, that at the annual election of the Ten the voting was partially suspended;

pended ; there was no election, and consequently there was no longer any Council of Ten. At the next sitting, however, so complete a reaction was produced by the speech of a grave and dignified orator of advanced years, Baptist Nani, that not only was the tribunal confirmed, but Nani was named its chief, and the service he had just rendered to the republic was entered in the Minutes.

The most convincing argument advanced for the preservation of the Council of Ten was that it was the mainspring of the system, and that the whole machinery of government would be dislocated by its abolition. Its paramount authority embraced foreign as well as domestic affairs. Thus in 1538, the Ten, without communication with the Senate or Doge, gave private instructions to the Venetian ambassador at Constantinople to make peace with the Turks at any sacrifice, and were obeyed. They had spies in every Court ; and annexed to an ambassadorial despatch, and addressed to their signories, is a billet, signed *Chiara, schiava della Gran Sultana* (Clara, the slave of the Grand Sultana). Their diplomatic servants were expected to be as unscrupulous as their masters. The ambassador, Daniel Dolfín, at Constantinople, having received orders to make away with the celebrated Comte de Bonneval as an enemy of Christianity and the Republic, replies that ‘the orders of the most illustrious and most excellent Signors are, and always will be, received with the highest consideration, and will be executed with the most rapid submission whenever there shall be means.’ In spite of their precautions, and the terrible fate that awaited an agent on the slightest symptom or suspicion of treachery, their own arts were successfully employed against them. In the Archives is a note, dated January 30, 1647, of a private interview between their ambassador at the French Court and Cardinal Mazarin, in the course of which Mazarin drew from his pocket and read a series of extracts from the recent dispatches of the self-same ambassador relating to the Cardinal himself.

The eagerness of foreign Courts to become acquainted with the Venetian dispatches was owing in no slight measure to the knowledge that they were not confined to formal matters of business, an ambassador of the Republic being especially instructed to keep the Signory minutely informed of all that was passing at the Courts to which he was accredited ; including the intrigues of courtiers and mistresses, the conflict of parties, and the secret influences at work. When he had fulfilled his mission, it was customary for him to present himself to the Senate within fifteen days after his return, and pronounce a discourse which, under the name of *Relazione*, was a comprehensive report upon

upon the country which he had just quitted. On leaving the hall, he deposited in the hands of the Grand Chancellor the original text of his 'Relazione,' which was immediately placed in the drawers of the *Secreta* reserved for diplomatic documents.

'Transport yourself to that noble locality of the senatorial hall. See it illustrated throughout with the splendours of the Venetian school. The ceiling, the walls, covered by the works of the great masters, recall the glories of the country; on every sides are the memorable images of illustrious ancestors. The Doge, clothed in the rich tunic of gold brocade which distinguished him: the sages and the councillors with their violet tunics: all the senators in purple robes; the Chiefs of the Ten, in tunics of a bright red, are there: a rumour had got abroad the evening before of a more than common interest for the morrow. The ambassador to France has returned: his reputation is great amongst the senators: he is a statesman, a fine speaker to boot.\*'

The scene, the audience, the occasion, were certainly well fitted to call out the full powers of the diplomatist, and the Venetian ambassadors were carefully selected from amongst the ablest and most accomplished of the nobles. No wonder, therefore, that the 'Relazioni' form an inestimable collection of materials for history. The only wonder is that they remained so long unappreciated except by a few men of letters; and that their real value is only just beginning to get recognised in this country.

M. Yriarte's 'Patrician' is a perfect type of the Venetian ambassador, and his diplomatic career (clearly and spiritedly narrated) enables us to form a tolerably precise estimate of the man. He was nominated to the French Court on June 11, 1561,

---

\* 'La Diplomatie Vénitienne. Les Princes de l'Europe au XVI<sup>me</sup> Siècle: François I<sup>er</sup>, Philippe II, Catherine de Médicis, les Papes, les Sultans, &c. D'après les Rapports des Ambassadeurs Vénitiens.' Par M. Armand Baschet. Paris: Henri Plon. 1862. This work is distinguished by the same high merits as his 'Archives.' Several volumes of 'Relazioni' have been published in France and Italy, and they have been turned to good account by many foreign writers. See 'Le Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato durante il Secolo XVI<sup>o</sup>. Edite dal Cav. Eug. Albèri. Firenze': in fifteen volumes, of which two are devoted to England. Lord Macaulay made a journey to Venice in 1856 for the purpose of consulting the archives. By the kindness of the Earl of Orford we have now before us a collection (in fourteen folio volumes, MS.) of the Dispatches of the Venetian ambassadors at the Court of London from 1715 to 1739 (both inclusive), and, after an unexplained break, during 1744, 1745, and 1746. They were copied, by his direction, with the view to a meditated Life of his celebrated ancestor, the first Earl of Orford, which no one is better qualified to write. The 'Relazioni' best known in England are those published by Mr. Rawdon Browne in 1854: 'Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII.,' 'Selection of Despatches written by the Venetian Ambassador, Sebastian Giminiani, and addressed to the Signory of Venice. 1515-1519.' See the 'Quarterly Review' for March 1855: Art. 'Venetian Despatches.'

during

during the regency of Catherine de Medicis. His appointments are specified at the end of his instructions.

‘ You will receive for your expenses two hundred ducats of gold per month, without being obliged to render an account to any one. You are bound to keep eleven horses, including those of the secretary and his servant, and four couriers. We have ordered to be given you for your four months’ subvention eight hundred ducats of gold ; you will have a thousand ducats of gold for the present, according to the decree of the Senate of June 2nd ; and to cover the expense of your purchases of horses’ harness and trappings, three hundred ducats (at six livres our gros the ducat). We remit to your secretary, as gratification, one hundred ducats, and to the couriers who accompany you twenty ducats each.’

In May 1568 he was named ambassador to Constantinople, the most important and lucrative of the embassies. It is filled by the Grand Council instead of the Senate, and twelve hundred members at least must be present when the appointment is made. It was a current opinion in Venice, says Daru, that when the Bailo (as this particular ambassador was called) departed for the embassy of Constantinople, he was presented with a casket of sequins and a box of poisons. On this M. Yriarte remarks : ‘ Certain historians, whom we cannot read without laughing now that we write with the original documents before our eyes, affirm that the Council of Ten, at the departure of the Bailo, solemnly presented him with a box full of sequins and another full of poisons. Even under these melodramatic exaggerations the truth appears, and the sentiment which has dictated them is even tolerably just. The sequins would symbolise the duty of not shrinking from expense in the service of the State, and of purchasing, if necessary, both the Seraglio and the Jews of the faubourgs of Stamboul. The poison would represent the duty of not recoiling from death, if it was necessary to serve the State and suppress a traitor or conspirator.’ But, the alleged solemnity apart, does not this admit that the historians were substantially correct? Was not the ambassador supplied with an unlimited amount of secret service money to be spent in bribery? Does it not appear from original documents that he was frequently directed to employ poison supplied by the Ten or their subordinates ?

The legitimate or permitted profits in the shape of dues and privileges were such, that M. Yriarte compares the position to that of the Captains-General of Cuba, who were sent there to make their fortunes when they were illustrious and poor. It was computed that the Bailo could lay by a hundred thousand crowns in three years ; and Mark Antonio remained Bailo for  
six.

six. The whole of his dispatches, four hundred in number, as well as his two 'Relazioni,' have been preserved, and abound in striking traits and incidents. The period was eventful. The main object of the mission was to conciliate the Sultan, Selim II., who was known to be hostilely disposed; and no means were left untried to reach him through the Grand Vizir, the Sultanas, and the favourite ladies of the hareem. Their common method of exaction, after receiving the usual presents in money and rich stuffs, was to commission the ambassador to procure for them European articles of ornament or use for which they never meant to pay. An entire page of a dispatch is filled with the design of a large mosque lamp, of which nine hundred are to be made for the Grand Vizir. The vizir wants an organ: the Aga of the Janissaries, who is building a house at the Sweet Waters, some painted glass windows; and one of the sultanas a thousand basins of steel. This last order staggered the Senate, who, after grave deliberation, direct the Bailo to say that the metal is not a Venetian product or they should be most happy to oblige the lady.

The year after his arrival, December 13, 1569, a destructive fire broke out in the arsenal of Venice, and no sooner has the news, with an exaggerated estimate of the loss in ships and material, reached Constantinople, than the exactions are redoubled: the Grand Vizir demands another supply of lamps, and it becomes clear that the Turks are only watching for a pretence to declare war. This is found in the refusal of the Republic to concede Cyprus, which the Sultan sends a special envoy to demand. On the very day when the refusal is received by the Divan, Marc Antonio Barbaro is arrested and shut up in a fortress: an embargo is laid on all Venetian vessels in Turkish waters, and all Venetian subjects within reach are treated like their ambassador. The Republic retaliated by seizing an ambassador of the Porte returning from France, who, being also charged with a mission to the Doge, had stopped at Venice on his way. They thus secured a hostage for the safety of their representative; but the Turks had too little regard for life to be stopped by reprisals, and in the course of the following year they gave a terrible proof of their profound indifference to faith, honour, and humanity.

The defence of Famagosta, the principal city of Cyprus, was one of the most heroic exploits of the age: the combined conduct and valour of the Venetian governor, Bragadino, were the theme of universal praise: honourable terms were granted to the garrison; and when he notified his intention to be in person the bearer of the keys, the Turkish commander replied in the most courteous  
and

and complimentary terms that he should feel honoured and gratified by receiving him. Bragadino came attended by the officers of his staff, dressed in his purple robes, and with a red umbrella, the sign of his rank, held over him. In the course of the ensuing interview the Pasha suddenly springing up, accused him of having put some Mussulman prisoners to death: the officers were dragged away and cut to pieces, whilst Bragadino was reserved for the worst outrages that vindictive cruelty could inflict. He was thrice made to bare his neck to the executioner, whose sword was thrice lifted as if about to strike: his ears were cut off: he was driven every morning for ten days, heavy laden with baskets of earth, to the batteries, and compelled to kiss the ground before the Pasha's pavilion as he passed. He was hoisted to the yard-arm of one of the ships and exposed to the derision of the sailors. Finally, he was carried to the square of Famagosta, stripped, chained to a stake on the public scaffold, and slowly flayed alive, whilst the Pasha looked on. His skin, stuffed with straw, was then mounted on a cow, paraded through the streets with the red umbrella over it, suspended at the bowsprit of the admiral's galley, and displayed as a trophy during the whole voyage to Constantinople. The skin was afterwards purchased of the Pasha by the family of Bragadino, and deposited, with a commemorative inscription, in an urn in the Church of Saints Giovanni and Paolo.

Marc Antonio was not ill-treated, nor could he have been subjected to a very rigorous confinement, for he managed to keep up a constant correspondence with the Republic; and when, after the battle of Lepanto, the Turks showed an inclination to negotiate, it was through him. 'He was engaged five months in settling the terms, with such secrecy and such prudence, that this peace, so advantageous, was not known at Venice till the moment when the treaty was signed.' It was so far from advantageous, that, as Montesquieu says, one would have thought it was the Turks who had gained the battle of Lepanto. The Grand Council, however, ratified it, and named Marc Antonio, in token of their approval, to the second dignity in the State. It was at his own pressing instance that he was recalled in March 1574, and his principal 'Relazione' was delivered in the May following. It contains a complete account of the Turkish empire, its resources, and its mode of government, with sketches of the Sultan and his ministers.

In 1543, the Patrician married the daughter of Marc Antonio Giustiniani, one of the family which, in the expedition of 1171 against the Greek emperor, furnished a hundred combatants all bearing the name. They perished (like the Fabii) to a man, and the

the race was only saved from extinction by taking the sole surviving member from a convent, and marrying him. M. Yriarte is obliged to own that he can learn nothing of the lady, or indeed of any of her fair contemporaries. He cannot even say whether she accompanied her husband on his embassies. 'In France at this epoch, the woman is revealed by the part she plays, whilst at Venice she only appears in the fêtes—brilliant, dazzling, adorned to please the eyes of the princes or the illustrious travellers who pass through, and never revealed by her moral influence or civilising action.' May it not have been owing to the part women had been playing in other countries that they were purposely kept in the background at Venice, where, moreover, manners had contracted somewhat of an Oriental tinge? 'At Rome,' says Sismondi, 'the women whilst seeking to please, wished also to exercise power; they attempted to rule, through their lovers, the State, and with it the Church, which made part of the State; and they acquired more authority over the Romans in the tenth century than they were ever known to exercise in any other government. Two famous patricians, Theodora and her daughter Marozia, disposed during the space of sixty years, of that tiara which the Henrys, at the head of German armies, a few years later, could not tear from their enemies.'\*

Venice differed widely from Rome, and indeed from every other Italian State, in this respect: we never find a woman playing a prominent part on the political arena there; and if Vidocq had been engaged to unravel any one of the complicated conspiracies which abound in Venetian annals, he would have derived little or no aid from his favourite maxim: *trouvez-moi la femme*.

The story of Bianca Capello can hardly be considered an exception, for the scene of her principal adventures was Florence. The daughter of an illustrious family, beautiful, accomplished and quick-witted, she had engaged in an intrigue with a good-looking young Florentine, named Pietro, the cashier of a bank. On her return from one of the nightly interviews with which she favoured him, she found the door of her father's house, which she had left open, closed against her—accidentally, it was supposed, by a baker's boy. Dreading discovery, she eloped with her lover to Florence, and threw herself upon the protection of Francesco dei Medici, the son of Cosmo, the reigning Duke, and virtual sovereign as his representative. Francesco fell in love with her, assigned her a magnificent establishment as his avowed mistress, and handsomely provided for Pietro, who passed for her

\* *Hist. des Rép. Ital.* vol. i. p. 95.

husband.



husband. He was found murdered : in the course of time Francesco's wife died, and the Prince, now Grand Duke, privately married Bianca. Getting more and more infatuated, he resolved to follow up the private by a public union, and sent an embassy to Venice to demand her in marriage, not as the daughter of Bartolomeo Capello but as the daughter of St. Marc. The laws of Venice forbade the marriage of any female scion of a noble house with a foreigner, but in the case of foreigners of distinguished position, the difficulty was got over by the adoption of the lady by the Republic. This was the formality observed when the Kings of Cyprus and Hungary accepted brides from Venice.

The conduct of the Venetian Government on this occasion is a striking example of their utter insensibility to elevated or honourable considerations of any kind when their interests were involved. Bianca's character was notorious : she was more than suspected of having two or three times resorted to assassination to remove obstacles from her path : she had been repudiated by her family as a blot on their escutcheon, and the Council of Ten, at their request, had pronounced a sentence of perpetual banishment on Pietro and set a price of 2000 ducats on his head. Yet, in a full and brilliant assemblage of the authorities, Bianca was adopted as 'the true and particular daughter of the Republic, on account and in consideration of the many eminent and distinguished qualities which rendered her worthy of every good fortune, and in order to meet with corresponding feelings the esteem which the Grand Duke had manifested towards Venice by this his most prudent resolution.' There was one person who watched these proceedings with very different feelings. Francesco's brother and heir-presumptive, the Cardinal dei Medici, was well acquainted with the character of his sister-in-law and hardly dissembled his hate. He accepted an invitation to a retired ducal residence, or hunting-seat, where he was residing as the guest of the Duke and Duchess, when they both fell ill and expired within a few hours of each other. The Medici were as apt and as unscrupulous in the use of poison as the Borgias ; and opinion was divided between two theories of the catastrophe : one, that the illustrious pair were poisoned by the Cardinal ; the other, that Francesco inadvertently partook of a dish seasoned by Bianca for his Eminence, and that, seeing the fatal effects on her lord, she swallowed the remainder. The popular belief was that the Cardinal had detected the poison by the change in the colour of his ring. On his accession to the dukedom, he not only denied the funeral honours due to the rank of his alleged victim, but caused her titles to be  
 erased

erased from all public documents, and *la pessima Bianca* to be substituted.\*

Judging from old pictures and engravings, it would certainly appear that, excluded from intellectual pursuits, the Venetian ladies led a somewhat frivolous life. As M. Yriarte, referring to the works of Paulus Furlanas in 1572, observes: 'We find nothing but attitudes, collations, displays of costumes: the little dogs are always reposing on the knees of their mistresses: we never see a woman occupied with a serious duty, or even an artistic pastime.' It is to be feared that the little dogs on the knees or in the arms of their mistresses, may lead to equally unfavourable inferences in illustrations of the manners and customs of the English of 1874.

One principal occupation of the Venetian ladies was giving their hair the golden or auburn tint which is so much admired in Venetian portraits and not long since was brought into temporary fashion in Paris and London, by the *demi-monde*. The process required that the hair, after being wetted with the prescribed mixture, should be dried in the sun; and the Venetian beauties might be seen sitting for hours together in open balconies, wearing wide-brimmed hats, with the crown out, to protect the complexion.†. One of their strangest fashions was the patten or stilt, which they used of such an extravagant height—eighteen inches or two feet—that a woman of rank could not go abroad without leaning on the shoulders of her maids. Acting on the true Chinese and Oriental principle, the Venetian husbands and fathers seem to have favoured this fashion. In a conversation which arose in a distinguished company before the Doge whose daughters were the first to discard the pattens, on some one saying that the ordinary shoes were incomparably more convenient, an elderly member of the Council exclaimed—'*Pur troppo commodi ! pur troppo*'—(very much too convenient ! very much).

The sumptuary laws, in restriction of female extravagance in dress, were severe, and particularly directed against pearls, for which enormous sums were given. But in anticipation of the public entry of the Duke of Savoy in 1608, it was resolved that, 'notwithstanding any decree to the contrary, every lady who shall be invited to the said fête shall be permitted to wear all the vestments and jewels of whatever nature that may seem to

---

\* 'Sketches,' vol. ii. pp. 331-341. The story, glossed over by Daru, forms the basis of two of Malespini's novels, in which, of course, the most romantic colouring is thrown over it.

† 'Les Femmes Blondes selon les Peintres de l'École de Venise.' Paris, 1865. Edited by M. Feuilles des Couches. Various recipes are given, and the process is minutely described.

her most favourable to the adornment of her person.' The same permission was granted on the reception of Henry III.

'The middle of the hall of the Great Council was left empty, and two hundred noble ladies, chosen amongst the noblest and most beautiful, entered and took their seats on benches ranged against the walls under the large pictures representing the history of the feasts of the Republic. Clothed in white stuffs, adorned with diamonds and pearls, they presented an unequalled spectacle, at which the King was evidently surprised, despite his recollection of the magnificence and gallantry of the court of the Valois. A rich throne was raised at the bottom of the room, on which the King was seated, having on his right the Doge and the Dukos, on his left the Nuncio, the Grand Prior, and the lords of his suite. Gallantly remarking that he wished to breathe this parterre of flowers, he descended the steps of the throne followed by his suite, and advanced as if to pass in review all these noble ladies, who saluted gracefully in return. He allowed his gaze to rest for a moment on each, and from time to time let drop an exclamation whilst looking for a confidant at his side to whom he might express his admiration. Little by little the young nobles came to make their selections: then slowly, in cadence, the groups were formed to the sound of instruments, and passed successively before the throne, stopping to pay their homage.'\*

A French ambassador at Venice in 1735, pressed by his Court to obtain intelligence, writes thus:—

'The access to nobles and secretaries is more difficult than formerly. The Abbé de Pomponne (ambassador in 1705) had at his command a courtesan, who was well paid, and kept him well informed. The principal nobles were in the habit of supping with her; they carried on their intrigues at her house, and spoke of public affairs. But we have no longer the same advantage: the nobles pay only passing visits to the courtesans. They now live familiarly with the ladies (*dames*). The young ladies who might be gained over are too ill-informed, seeing only young people and few good heads. The better-informed old ladies are difficult of approach.'

It would be a mistake to suppose that this change in the habits of the nobles implied any improvement in morals. The women of condition could only obtain a divided empire with the courtesans by imitating them. 'The parlours of the convents,' says Daru, 'in which the daughters of noble families were placed, and the houses of courtesans, although the police kept a watchful eye on them, were the sole points of union of the society of Venice, and in the two so contrasted places all were equally free. Music, collations, gallantry, were no more forbidden in the parlours than in the casinos. There were a great number of public casinos where play was the principal object.'

---

\* 'I a Vie d'un Patricien,' p. 289.

At one of these, the Ridotto, as many as eighty gaming-tables have been counted, with a patrician presiding at each; the privilege of holding the bank being confined to the patrician order. In strange contrast to the regulation by which they evaded their promise to permit gambling between the columns, the Republic now openly encouraged it along with every sort of dissoluteness. 'There was no doubt a moment,' continues Daru, 'when the destruction of fortunes, the ruin of families, domestic discords, determined the Government to depart from the maxims they had laid down as to the freedom of morals they allowed their subjects. They banished all the courtesans from Venice. But their absence was insufficient to reform a population brought up in the most shameful licentiousness. Disorder penetrated into the interior of families, into the cloisters; and they were obliged to recall, to indemnify, to coax back the women (*nostre bene merite meretrici*, as they are called in the decree) who sometimes surprised important secrets, and could be usefully employed to ruin men who might otherwise become dangerous by their wealth.'

The same detestable policy was continued to the end, and that end was fast approaching. 'Be at ease,' said Napoleon to Bourrienne, 'those rogues shall pay for it; their Republic has lived.' Having recently called attention to the manner in which this ominous intimation was acted upon,\* we shall merely add that their cowardice and meanness were on a par with his cynical contempt for international obligations and his bad faith. Cantu admits that they had ample resources, naval and military, for a stubborn and prolonged defence; but they were enervated to effeminacy; the Republic, rotten to the core, was ready to go down with a push; and when the question of resistance or non-resistance was put to the vote at the last sitting of the Great Council, the unqualified and instant surrender of their liberties, of their very existence as an independent people, was carried almost by acclamation, by 512 votes against 12.

The Venetian Republic, dating it from the closing of the Council in 1296, had lasted five hundred years; it was not merely the only European constitution that had successfully resisted revolutionary change during anything like that length of time, but it was the only modern aristocracy or oligarchy that ever held the supreme power long enough to constitute a settled government at all; for Mr. Disraeli's favourite theory that, during a large part of the last century, the English constitution resembled that of Venice, is an amusing paradox at best. But the durability of an institution is only a merit or a good when the institution

---

\* The 'Quarterly Review' for April, 1870: Article on Lanfrey's 'Napoleon.'  
contributes

contributes to human happiness or intellectual progress—when it helps to make men wiser or better; not when it degrades and corrupts with a view to enslaving them, systematically undermining or stamping out every notion or sentiment of honour, generosity, virtue, and patriotism, lest that very durability should be weakened or destroyed. The chief glories of Venice were won under her ancient Doges: her few illustrious men flourished in despite of her laws; and if she had lived only half her life, her reputation would stand better with posterity.

That, then, the Republic was a model of perverted ingenuity is undeniable, but to call it, as has been the fashion amongst historians, a masterpiece of political wisdom is tantamount to maintaining that the highest political wisdom consists in the successful application of the maxims laid down by Machiavel in ‘The Prince.’ Far from regretting the catastrophe, we feel irresistibly impelled to exclaim with the poet,—

‘Mourn not for Venice—though her fall  
Be awful as if Ocean’s wave  
Swept o’er her—she deserves it all,  
And Justice triumphs o’er her grave.  
Thus perish every King and Stato  
That run the guilty race she ran,  
Strong but in fear, and only great  
By outrage against God and man.’

ART. VI.—*Life of John Coleridge Patteson, Missionary Bishop of the Melanesian Islands.* By Charlotte Mary Yonge. In two volumes. London, 1874.

**T**HIS is a large, but not a bulky, Biography. For the word bulk insinuates the idea of size in excess of pith and meaning. But if there be a class of human lives deserving a copious record, to that class unquestionably belongs the life of Bishop Patteson. Indeed, the only complaint we have to make with reference to the first aspect of the work is, that it conveys the idea of a Biography properly so called, whereas by far the greater part, probably four-fifths of the whole, presents to us the Bishop’s life in the Bishop’s own most living words; and the work might perhaps be more accurately entitled ‘The Letters and Life of Bishop Patteson.’ If we are to find a fault with the distinguished authoress, it is not that she observes, as might have been anticipated, a graceful modesty with respect to the munificence with which it is known that she devoted to holy purposes the fruits of her mental power, but that she might with advantage have been more copious on some heads of information

information respecting either the Bishop himself or the scene of his labours, which she presupposes rather than supplies.

Biographies, like painted portraits, range over an immense scale of value: the highest stand at a very elevated point indeed, and the lowest, in which this age has been beyond all others fertile, descend far below zero. Human nature is in itself a thing so wonderful, so greatly paramount among all the objects offered to our knowledge, that there are few pieces or specimens of it which do not deserve and reward observation. But then they must be true, and must breathe the breath of life; they must give us, not the mere clothes, or graveclothes, of the man, but the man himself. For this reason it is that autobiographies (unless when a distinguished man is unfortunately tempted, as appears to have been the case with Lord Brougham, to write his own life from old newspapers) are commonly of real interest, for every man does his best to make his own portrait a likeness. And for this reason also it may be that, in so many cases, the personal memoirs of men of religious celebrity are flat, stale, and unprofitable to a degree, because they are, beyond all others, unreal and got up. Sometimes, with a good deal of excuse, feelings of natural piety, and sometimes, with no excuse at all, the supposed interests of sect or clique, withhold altogether from view the faults, errors, or inequalities, through some or all of which it was that the man was indeed a man, a being of mixed character, to be remembered usefully for warning, and for caution, as well as for imitation, or for pious unreasoning wonder. In the case especially of missionaries we fear that there is a special danger of this want of reality and truth. For here the begging bore is continually in the mind of the writer; and probably there is, on the whole, no description of running story which is told with so much unconscious or half-conscious falsification as theirs. For, were the whole truth to be given, what would be the effect on the collection after this or that sermon, or on the subscription list after this or that meeting, where the Rev. Blank Blank appeared specially as a deputation on the part of 'the parent society'? Of these, and of all falsifications, studious or careless, the transparent man, whose Biography we are commending to notice, had a perfect horror. More than this; he had a horror of the pretentious and theatrical; nay of the merely public, exhibition even of the truth. His pastoral work with the Melanesian Islanders was too intensely spiritual in its detail to bear presentation periodically to the common eye, without a reflected influence of self-consciousness on the principal agent, which would have marred its delicacy, its purity, its simplicity. A passage of the volumes casts upon this subject a casual ray of

Vol. 137.—No. 274. 2 I light,

light, which reveals much of the inner nature of the man. His friend and coadjutor, Mr. Codrington, says :—

‘ It is characteristic of Bishop Patteson that I never heard him say a word, that I remember, of religion to one of the sick. On such things he would not, unless he was obliged, speak except with the patient alone.’—Vol. ii. p. 320.

And again, in September, 1868 :—

‘ The Bishop then began a custom of preaching to his black scholars alone after the midday service, dismissing his five or six white companions after prayers, because he felt he could speak more freely, and go more straight to the hearts of his converts and catechumens, if he had no other audience.’—Vol. ii. p. 322.

To some this may sound little less than shocking. He ought, it would perhaps be said, in the spirit of modern religionism, to have ‘ let his light shine ’ more fully ‘ before men,’ and to have sought the edification not only of the coloured islander but of the literary European bystander. Such was not Patteson’s conception of his very arduous work. It had at once to open the minds, to mould the ideas, and to enter into the inmost souls of beings just extricated from a singularly inartificial and child-like barbarism ; in the case of the sick, to deliver them over, or prepare for so delivering them, into the unveiled presence of the Eternal. This was ever for him an absolutely absorbing task ; and no particle of himself, no jot or tittle of energies which he knew to be when undivided still insufficient, would he suffer to be diverted by any side issue, or regard to thing or person other than the human soul he was endeavouring to rear to its maturity.

How, it may well be asked, how, under such circumstances, can we attain to any full, real, inward knowledge of this great Missionary Bishop, and of his work ? The answer is that, with that wonderful multiplying force which is the gift of affectionate natures, while he carried his heart to the zone of the South Pacific, he left it also in England. The singular warmth of his domestic affections stands, as to certain points, in a touching strife with his devotion to his duty. He does not encourage, he even refuses, the visit of his sisters after their father’s death, lest they should at once suffer hardship and draw him off from his daily, hourly, prosecution of his work (vol. ii. p. 18). But to the beloved members of his family he was able to make an effusion of himself, in constant letters by every mail, which, for its warmth and its completeness, as to all except the absolutely inward sphere of his religious life, has, perhaps, never been excelled, and to which we are indebted for a record worthy, in  
our

our judgment, of the Apostolic office ; and of the Christian religion, even in the bloom and glow of its prime. But as to all he wrote to them, he was most jealous lest it should be unveiled.

‘ I can’t write brotherly letters, if they are to be treated as public property. I would not trust my own brother to make extracts from my letters. No one in England can be a judge of the mischief that the letters occasion printed contrary to my wish by friends.’—Vol. ii. p. 175. . . .

‘ I like,’ he writes at Easter, 1869, ‘ to tell you what I think, and I know you will keep it to yourselves.’ Thus it is that we come to have before us the fervent outpourings of a singularly reflective and introspective, as well as active, mind, like flowers caught in their freshness, and perfectly preserved in colour and in form.

No mere review can do justice to this book, but we hope to supply what may incite some readers to obtain for themselves an acquaintance with its contents. •

The name he bore, John Coleridge Patteson, indicated the combination in his blood of two honoured families, second to none in the contributions they have made to the intellectual and moral wealth of the nation.

He was born on the 1st of April, 1827 ; and he was incomparably happy in his parents, both of whom so stamped themselves upon his mind and heart that, down to the very last, when they had been long called to their rest, he is ever reverting to them. His mother appears to have been as excellent in the rearing of her children, as his father was distinguished among the sages of the law. But Judge Patteson, a lawyer unsurpassed in his day (which was a great day), was also no common Churchman ; in feeling and opinion a thorough and loyal child of the Church of England ; in knowledge far from a mean theologian, and one whose direct guiding influence is constantly acknowledged by his son during his lifetime, and longed for after his death.

We will not dwell on the incidents of his childhood, beyond observing that he was (i. 7) deeply and warmly affectionate, but not free from occasional outbreaks of will and temper, the fiery material of future activity and energy under holy discipline. But his religious history is without crisis, shock, or start : there seems to have been from the first a central principle of life, which gradually brought under its sway every part and faculty of the man. ‘ Consideration for others, kindness, and sweetness of nature, were always his leading characteristics’ : and when a foundation is thus broadly laid in a radical unselfishness there is little to fear for the final result.



He went through the normal course of an Eton and Oxford education. At twelve years old, his powers of self-reproach were already active: and it is to be observed that throughout life, when blaming himself, he never attenuates the blame, or shifts any portion of responsibility upon others. He was profoundly impressed by a farewell sermon which Bishop Selwyn preached in October, 1841, at Windsor, where the Bishop had acted as curate; and when calling on his mother to bid farewell, that eminent Prelate and Missionary said, with a kind of prophetic anticipation, 'Lady Patteson, will you give me Coley?' (i. 29). The youth also told her it was his greatest wish to go with the Bishop. Meantime the whole tone of his life seems to have been thoroughly healthy. In the prime article of Eton school-work, his verses, he was—like Bishop Selwyn—highly distinguished: he was among the Select for the Newcastle Scholarship in 1844: he spoke remarkably well in the Debating Society; and at cricket he attained to the highest honours of the Eleven. Even in these early days, he combined the widest popularity with an uncompromising adherence to what was right (i. 40). Success did not beget conceit: and failure, which was the exception, only roused his energies (i. 46). At Oxford, where he entered with deep interest into the religious movement of the day, he obtained, in 1849, a classical second-class, and subsequently a Fellowship of Merton. His examination for his degree was followed by a tour in Germany and Italy, which served to develop alike his strong love of Art, and his remarkable turn for languages. He was in due time presented to the Pope: but what a contrast between the two episcopal careers! In 1852, he studied Hebrew at Dresden; and he made himself a thorough German scholar. In questions connected with the administration and government of his College, he was a decided reformer (i. 135). His mind had undergone rapid development, and he had largely surveyed the religious dissensions of the day, when he was ordained in 1853, and took the curacy of Alfington. In this village, where a church with a parsonage and school had been built by his distinguished uncle, Sir John Coleridge, he had already served an apprenticeship while he was preparing for holy orders. His course here was a short one, but he prosecuted it as the work of his life: and the sweet smile and musical voice which were afterwards to win their way in the far islands of the south, powerfully helped to open his access to the hearts of the people of Alfington. Nearly all the items of the varied experience of daily life, at all times, he took most kindly. But general society he never loved: small talk, he declares, he could not manufacture; and morning callers were the plague of his life.

Ordained

Ordained on the 14th of September, 1853, he joined, on the 19th of August, 1854, in welcoming the Bishop of New Zealand, who came to visit England after twelve years of work, during which he had founded his church, organised its government, and planned his system of missionary aggression on the five groups of islands which he combined under the collective name of Melanesia: the Solomon Islands in the north-west, the Banks and Santa Cruz clusters in the midst, and the New Hebrides and Loyalty Islands to the south-west and south. After greeting him, Patteson retired to seek relief for his emotion in a 'great burst of tears.' Bishop Selwyn was in all ways qualified to become the hero of his imagination, and to impart the main impulse of his life. Of a commanding presence, of frank and manly character, distinguished both in mental and bodily pursuits, and universally beloved, he was, as it were, reflected in his young friend as to all these points: and in quitting a career of prosperity and promise, already well begun at home, for the charge of an unformed church in an unformed colony at the Antipodes, it had been the Bishop's happy lot to lift the standard of self-sacrifice to a more conspicuous and a more generally felt and acknowledged elevation than it had heretofore reached among us. But we feel confident that a Selwyn claims, and can claim, no higher honour than to have had a Patteson for his pupil.

The Bishop now followed up the thought of 1841, 'Will you give me Coley?' His words fell upon a mind, in the young man himself, already charged with the subject. Sir John Patteson, who had become a widower in the interval, determined to offer freely his large share of the sacrifice. And his son, in accepting the invitation, acted upon a feeling which had been 'continually present with him and constantly exercising an increasing influence over him' (i. 173). He left all his villagers deploring his departure, and on March 29, 1855, he sailed from Gravesend, with the Bishop, for New Zealand.

As early as 1848 and 1849, Bishop Selwyn had visited the Islands. His resolution was never to preach in a place already occupied by missions: and Melanesia was almost entirely open ground. He rapidly perceived that it was vain to think of dealing with this host of islands by planting a resident English clergyman in each of them. He likewise believed that no church could take effectual root without a native clergy, and he accordingly determined upon his plan; which was, to bring boys from the Islands to New Zealand, to educate them there in St. John's College, near Auckland, which he had founded for the colonists, and so to return them home to be the teachers of their countrymen.

countrymen. This plan, which bears so clearly the stamp of an organising mind, has been in action ever since: with only some change in its form. For the climate, first of St. John's College and then, as experience taught, of New Zealand in even its most suitable spots, was found too cold for the constitutions of the islanders. Hence it came about that the headquarters of the Mission were in course of time removed, on that account, to Norfolk Island, which is half-way between the colony and the nearest points of Melanesia. Still later, and in correspondence with the progress of the work, a permanent establishment was founded on the Island of Mota, a central point for the whole of Melanesia. From the time of its beginning, Bishop Selwyn had never intermitted the prosecution of his enterprise. Thus the field, into which he carried Mr. Patteson, was one now made ready for extended cultivation. In that field he wrought earnestly, until December, 1859, with and under the senior Bishop himself, who led the way in all responsibility, effort, and exposure; and cast, and exhibited to his younger eye, the mould wherein his work was to be shaped.

In 1860, when the Melanesian company was transported to the more genial site of Kohimarama, near Auckland, he took charge of it; and here he lays down the proposition which was the guide of his missionary life to the last. 'The school is the real work.' Only by patient, searching, personal, and sole persuasion did he think it possible to perform that double operation, which has now come into the place of the single one confided to the Apostles: that is to say, the conversion of savages into civilised men, and of, at the same time, in the same persons, of heathens into Christians. There is no labour more intense than that of teaching, when the instructor throws his whole heart into it; it was enhanced by an endless variety of languages and dialects; and this, as it was in quantity the greatest, was also in quality the most exhausting of Mr. Patteson's occupations.

He was, however, to be Mr. Patteson but little longer. In despite of his modest reluctance, he obeyed the urgent requisition of Bishop Selwyn, and agreed to undertake the Episcopal office. In this year, 1860, he assumed the direction of the Melanesian voyage, and founded a Mission House at Mota, 'the first station of the Church's tabernacle planted in all Melanesia' (i. 459). In February, 1861, came the time of his consecration. On the eve of it, there was a special and private meeting for worship, ending with the *Gloria in excelsis*.

'Then the dear Bishop (of New Zealand) walked across to me, and taking my hand in both of his, looking at me with that smile of love  
and

and deep, deep thought so seldom seen, and so highly prized, "I can't tell you what I feel," he said, with a low and broken voice. "You know it; my heart is so full."—Vol. i. p. 488.

He was consecrated on the 24th of February, the Feast of St. Matthias; and from this time, for ten and a half years, remained in sole charge of the missions of the Church in the islands. Lady Martin supplies the following brief notice of the service:—

'I shall never forget the expression of his face as he knelt in the quaint rochet. It was meek, and holy, and calm, as though all conflict was over, and he was resting in the Divine strength. It was altogether a wonderful scene; the three consecrating Bishops, all such noble-looking men, the goodly company of clergy, and Hohua's fine intelligent brown face among them, and then the long line of island boys, and of St. Stephen's native teachers and their wives, were living testimonies of mission work.'—Vol. i. p. 492.

He was now formally installed in the Chapel of St. Andrew as Head of the College; and from this time he directed and conducted the annual voyages and all the missionary operations, though, of course, with the full counsel and support of Bishop Selwyn, both as his Primate, and as the original pioneer. His domestic life, continually exercised in the most affectionate correspondence; his intellectual life, maintained by eager reading at those spare times which he contrived to find; his scientific life, in the study and construction of the languages; his pastoral life, in the varied functions of teaching, training, and public ministrations; and his life of external energy in organising, and in manual work—all proceeded in equable and harmonious activity, interrupted only by the sad crises of dysentery and fever, when day and night were alike absorbed, and by the great grief of a murderous attack on his party at Santa Cruz in 1864. During all this time he seems never to have had a thought for himself, but only for his people, and for his office with a view to his people. One force he largely employed to draw and win men, and to bind them to himself—the force of love:—

'It was in those private classes that he exercised such wonderful influence; his musical voice, his holy face, his gentle manner, all helping doubtless to impress and draw even the dullest.'—Vol. i. p. 398.

Putting down his natural fastidiousness, not avoiding the very humblest of duties, he gave dignity to those duties, instead of disparaging his office in his own person by performing them; and his authority over white and black alike, which was never compromised, maintained itself by a gentle tact, even as the most complete control over spirited horses is achieved  
by

by the most delicate hand. But now we will try to let him speak a little for himself.

Some idea of his many-sidedness may be conveyed by the following passage:—

‘I can hardly tell you how much I regret not knowing something about the treatment of simple surgical cases. If when with W—— I had studied the practical—bled, drawn teeth, mixed medicines, rolled legs perpetually, it would have been worth something. Surely I might have foreseen all this! I really don’t know how to find the time or the opportunity for learning. How true it is that men require to be trained for their particular work! I am now just in a position to know what to learn, were I once more in England. Spend one day with old Fry (mason), another with John Venn (carpenter), and two every week at the Exeter Hospital, and not look on and see others work—there’s the mischief, do it oneself. Make a chair, a table, a box, fit everything, help in every part of making and furnishing a house, that is, a cottage. Do enough of every part to be able to do the whole. Begin by felling a tree, saw it into planks, mix the lime, see the right proportion of sand, &c., know how to choose a good lot of timber, fit handles for tools, &c.

‘Many trades need not be attempted, but every missionary ought to be a carpenter, a mason, something of a butcher, and a good deal of a cook.’—Vol. i. pp. 378–9.

In a letter to his brother and sister he describes the dysentery at the New Zealand College in 1863:—

‘Hospital, St. Andrew’s:

‘Saturday night, 9 P.M., March 22, 1863.

‘MY DEAREST BROTHER AND SISTER,—I write from the dining-hall (now our hospital), with eleven Melancsians lying round in extremity of peril. I buried two to-day in one grave, and I baptized another now dying by my side.

‘God has been pleased in His wisdom and mercy to send upon us a terrible visitation, a most virulent form of dysentery. Since this day fortnight I have scarce slept night or day, but by snatching an hour here and there; others are working quite as hard, and all the good points of our Melancsian staff are brought out, as you may suppose.

‘The best medical men cannot suggest any remedy. All remedies have been tried and failed. Every conceivable kind of treatment has been tried in vain.

‘There are in the hall (the hospital now) at this moment eleven—eleven more in the little quadrangle, better, but in as anxious a state as can be; and two more not at all well.

‘I have sent all the rest on board to be out of the way of contagion. How we go on I scarce know. . . . My good friend, Mr. Lloyd, is here, giving great help; he is well acquainted with sickness, and a capital nurse.

‘I have felt all along that it would be good for us to be in trouble; we could not always sail with a fair wind, I have often said so, and  
God

God has sent the trial in the most merciful way. What is this to the falling away of our baptized scholars!

'But it is a pitiful sight! How wonderfully they bear the agony of it. No groaning.

'When I buried those two children to-day, my heart was full, I durst not think, but could only pray and believe and trust in Him. God bless you.

: Your loving Brother,  
'J. C. P.

'O Lord, correct me, but with judgment!'

—Vol. ii. pp. 42-3.

His day in Mota was thus partitioned:—

'At daylight I turn off my table and dress, *not elaborately*,—a flannel shirt, old trousers, and shoes; then a yam or two is roasted on the embers, and the coffee made, and (fancy the luxury here in Mota!) delicious goat's milk with it. Then the morning passes in reading, writing, and somewhat desultory talking with people, but you can't expect punctuality and great attention. Then at one, a bit of biscuit and cheese (as long as the latter lasts). Mr. Palmer made some bread yesterday. Then generally a walk to meet people at different villages, and talk to them, trying to get them to ask me questions, and I try to question them. Then at 6 P.M., a tea-ation, viz., yam and coffee, and perhaps a crab or two, or a bit of bacon, or some good thing or other. But I forgot! This morning we ate a bit of our first full-grown and fully ripe Mota pine-apple (I brought some two years ago), as large and fine as any specimens I remember in hot-houses. If you mention all these luxuries, we shall have no more subscriptions, but you may add that there is as yet no other pine-apple, though our oranges, lemons, citrons, guavas, &c., are coming on. . . .

'Then after tea—a large party always witnessing that ceremony—there is an hour or so spent in speaking again to the people, and then I read a little with Wadrokala and Carry. Then Mr. Palmer and I read a chapter of Vaughan on the Revelation, then prayers, and so to bed.'—Vol. ii. pp. 142-3.

His day in New Zealand is described in a letter to Professor Max Müller, intended to excuse him for not making more rapid progress in his philological labours:—

'I get in the full summer months an hour for reading by being dressed at 5.30 A.M. At 5.30 I see the lads washing, &c., 7 A.M. breakfast all together in hall, 7.30 chapel, 8-9.30 school, 9.30-12.30 industrial work. During this time I have generally half-an-hour with Mr. Pritt about business matters, and proof sheets are brought me, yet I get a little time for preparing lessons. 12.45 short service in chapel, 1 dinner, 2-3 Greek Testament with English young men, 3-4 classics with ditto, 5 tea, 6.30 evening chapel, 7-8.30 evening school with divers classes in rotation, or with candidates for Baptism or Confirmation, 8.30-9 special instruction to more advanced scholars, only

only a few, 9-10 school with two other English lay assistants. Add to all this, visitors interrupting me from 4-5, correspondence, accounts, trustee business, sermons, nursing sick boys, and all the many daily unexpected little troubles that must be smoothed down, and questions enquired into, and boys' conduct investigated, and what becomes of linguistics? So much for my excuse for my small progress in languages! Don't think all this egotistical; it is necessary to make you understand my position.'—Vol. ii. p. 186.

It is the same tenor of life in Norfolk Island:—

'I am just finishing a translation of St. John, and have written many Psalms, &c., besides some four and a half or five hours teaching daily: not much, yet more than I did at Kohimarama, where I had a good deal of English Sunday work, and many interruptions. Here I can write from 6 A.M. to 10 P.M., and have really no distractions to speak of. Chapel at 7 A.M., breakfast (all together, of course) 7-30, school 8-9-30, work 9-30-1, dinner over in twenty minutes or so (not very elaborate), school 2-3, tea 6, school 7-8, chapel 8, when I catechise, and to my delight, at last, the Melanesians freely, *as a regular thing*, ask me all kinds of questions. I leave them about 9, but my room opens into the chapel, and they sit there, many of them, till 10 talking over points; sometimes come in to me, &c., and so the day ends. Codrington and I don't pledge ourselves to out-door work from 9-30-1; and I have lessons to prepare for candidates for Baptism, Holy Communion and Orders (three Englishmen). You would like to be with us for a day; and I think you would be touched by the reverence of young men and lads and boys in chapel, of whom I could tell strange stories indeed, and by hearing the *Venite* chanted to "Jacob" in a strange tongue, and other music. There are times when my heart feels very full.'—Vol. ii. pp. 287-8.

The incessant labours and occasional dangers of his life were relieved by his vivid interest in the work, by his giving and taking the pleasures of domestic affection, and by his enjoyment of a climate which was to him highly genial. But the most marked characteristic of his life in its passive part was, without doubt, this, that even when grief was absent, and care was at its highest, it was a daily enduring of hardness. Quite casually he mentions his expenses for six months at about 20*l.* (ii. 333). But it is just this feature of hardness, that he is ever endeavouring to throw into the shade. We have seen the use he makes of the solitary pine-apple in Mota. From Norfolk Island he describes and dwells upon the comforts of his room; a print, a photograph, books, and flowers, though no carpet or curtains, which 'only hold dust and make the room fusty' (ii. 397). 'Such are missionary comforts; where the hardships are, I have not yet discovered.' The 'perfect cup of coffee,' or 'a four-pound tin of Bloxam's preserved meat from Queensland,' half of which had lasted

lasted him for twelve days, and which served to season his 'yam deliciously cooked' (ii. 258), is ever carefully recorded against himself, and to satisfy his loving correspondents. But never except once, so far as we are able to discover, did his mode of living, in bed or board or clothing, rise even to the modest standard of clerical life at home; then, indeed, he found himself amid the comforts and even luxuries of a European gentleman. The occasion was a *voyage* to Australia, for an active and laborious circuit there with the purpose of giving information and obtaining aid. He records his condition on board the steamer from New Zealand to Sydney on February 6, 1864, with a child-like wonder and freshness:—

'Fancy me on board a screw steamer, 252 feet long, with the best double cabin on board for my own single use, the manager of the Company being anxious to show me every attention, eating away at all sorts of made dishes, puddings, &c., and lounging about just as I please on soft red velvet sofas and cushions.'—Vol. ii. p. 82.

And his biographer thankfully mentions the benefit he derived from this one involuntary backsliding into comfort and fairly good living; such, at least, as they could be to one who, with all his cheerful acceptance of sea-life, never loved the sea:—

'Generally, he shrank into himself, and became reserved at once if pressed to tell of his own doings. He spoke one evening quite openly about his dislike to ship life. We were laughing at some remembrance of the Bishop of Lichfield's satisfaction when once afloat, and he burst into an expression of wonder, how anyone could go to sea for pleasure. I asked him what he disliked in particular, and he answered, everything. That he always felt dizzy, headaching, and unable to read with comfort; the food was greasy, and there was a general sense of dirt and discomfort.'—Vol. ii. pp. 447-8.

This habitual reserve about himself was based upon his profound humility, the proof of which bristles, or to speak more appropriately softly plays, upon every page of the volumes.

The spirit of fun, which had had free play in his boyhood, did not depart from him during his episcopate, and it found most fit openings in the innocent festivities (ii. 328) with which, after the religious office, he celebrated those marriages between his Melanesian converts, which were among the social first-fruits of his work. Nothing conveys a higher idea of his moral force, than the way in which he brought these people to a life of strictness in the point, in which the customs and tradition of the islands were most relaxed. Once we hear of a lapse from purity, in which he commuted the wrath, that a harsher man would have felt, into a sympathetic pain. He treated the case, however, according



according to the rules of a sound and considerate Church discipline. The following detail will give an idea of his tenderness of hand :—

‘His own words (not suggested by me) were, “I tempted God often, and He let me fall: I don’t mean He was the cause of it, it is, of course, only my fault; but I think I see that I might have gone on getting more and more careless, and wandering further and further from Him unless I had been startled and frightened.” And then he burst out, “Oh! don’t send me away for ever. I know I have made the young ones stumble, and destroyed the happiness of our settlement here. I know I must not be with you all in chapel and school and hall. I know I can’t teach any more, I know that, and I am miserable, miserable. But don’t tell me I must go away for ever. I can’t bear it!”

‘I did manage to answer almost coldly, for I felt that if I once let loose my longing desire to let him see my real feeling, I could not restrain myself at all. “Who wishes to send you away, U——? It is not *me* whom you have displeased and injured.”

“I know. It is terrible! But I think of the Prodigal Son. Oh! I do long to go back! Oh! do tell me that He loves me still.”

‘Poor dear fellow! I thought I must leave him to bear his burthen for a time. We prayed together, and I left him, or rather sent him away from my room, but he could neither eat nor sleep.

‘The next day his whole manner, look, everything made one sure (humanly speaking) that he was indeed truly penitent; and then when I began to speak words of comfort, of God’s tender love and compassion, and told him how to think of the Lord’s gentle pity when he appeared first to the Magdalene and Peter, and when I took his hand in the old loving way, poor fellow, he broke down more than ever, and cried like a child.’—Vol. ii. pp. 347–8.

By degrees restoration to full Christian standing was granted.

Considerate in such matters, we might be sure he was not less considerate in regard to the sometimes difficult questions arising in heathen lands out of the divisions of sect. He set up, as we have seen, no rival missions. He corresponded with a Wesleyan missionary on a subject of common interest to both. He declined applications for pastoral care from the people of Lifú, where the agency of the London Missionary Society had existed, but had for some time been suspended, on learning that two missionaries were on the way from Sydney (i. 419–20). In that same island he had (in 1858) attended the service conducted by a native teacher acting under the Society, and only officiated himself when he had found, from good authority, that there would be no objection. His costume on this occasion was no other than a black coat and white tie, and he pursued the manner of service common among Presbyterians and Dissenters, though

though employing freely the language of the Prayer Book in his extemporary prayer (i. 363-6). 'I felt,' he says, 'quite at my ease while preaching, and John told me it was all very clear; but the prayers—oh! I did long for one of our Common Prayer Books.'

His early promise as a speaker would seem to have been amply fulfilled in his preaching and speaking faculty. But without doubt what preponderated in his sermons and addresses was the intensity of their ethical character. Listen to the description of Lady Martin.\* At the critical period when he was about finally to part from Bishop Selwyn in 1868, he said the prayers in the private chapel.

'After these were ended (Lady Martin says), he spoke a few words to us. He spoke of our Lord standing on the shore of the lake after His resurrection; and he carried us, and I think himself too, out of the heaviness of sorrow into a region of peace and joy, where all conflict and partings and sin shall cease for ever. It was not only what he said, but the tones of his musical voice, and expression of peace on his own face, that hushed us into a great calm. One clergyman, who was present, told Sir William Martin that he had never known anything so wonderful. The words were like those of an inspired man.'—Vol. ii. pp. 338-9.

It is, however, also plain that perhaps his most notable pastoral gifts lay in the closeness, clearness, and affectionateness, of his addresses in personal conference with the Melanesians; his rare faculty of language enabling him to combat the difficulties of so many foreign tongues, and his deep reverence preserving him from the great risk of caricaturing sacred things by inapt use of his instrument. And observe how skilfully, with the one great idea of converting islanders through islanders was in his mind, he conducts the instruction of a class on the 9th chapter of the Acts, and leads his scholars up to the act of self-dedication.

"Did our Lord tell Saul all that he was to do?"

"No."

"What! not even when He appeared to him in that wonderful way from Heaven?"

"No."

"What did the Lord say to him?"

"That he was to go into Damascus, and there it would be told him what he was to do."

"What means did the Lord use to tell Saul what he was to do?"

"He sent a man to tell him."

"Who was he?"

"Ananias."

"Do we know much about him?"

"No,

"No, only that he was sent with a message to Saul to tell him the Lord's will concerning him, and to baptize him."

"What means did the Lord employ to make His will known to Saul?"

"He sent a disciple to tell him."

"Did He tell him Himself immediately?"

"No, he sent a man to tell him."

"Mention another instance of God's working in the same way, recorded in the Acts."

"The case of Cornelius, who was told by the angel to send for Peter."

"The angel then was not sent to tell Cornelius the way of salvation?"

"No, God sent Peter to do that."

"Jesus Christ began to do the same thing when He was on earth, did He not, even while He was Himself teaching and working miracles?"

"Yes; He sent the twelve Apostles and the seventy disciples."

"But what is the greatest instance of all; the greatest proof to us that God chooses to declare His will through man to man?"

"God sent His own Son to become man."

"Could He not have converted the whole world in a moment to the obedience of faith by some other way?"

"Yes."

"But what did He in His wisdom choose to do?"

"He sent His Son to be born of the Virgin Mary, to become man, and to walk on this earth as a real man, and to teach men, and to die for men."

"What does Jesus Christ call us men?"

"His brethren."

"Who is our Mediator?"

"The *Man*, Christ Jesus."

"What means does God employ to make His will known to us?"

"He uses men to teach men."

"Can they do this by themselves?"

"No, but God makes them able."

"How have *you* heard the Gospel?"

"Because God sent you to us."

"And now, listen. How are all your people still in ignorance to hear it? What have I often told you about that?"

Whereupon the scholars looked shy, and some said softly, "We must teach them."

"Yes, indeed you must." — Vol. ii. pp. 178–80.

Among the many remarkable points in this very eminent life, not the least noteworthy of all is its many-sidedness. There seems to have been no office or function, however high or however humble, to which Bishop Patteson could not turn, and turn effectively, his mind or hand. There is one characteristic of the

the old-fashioned public school and college education of England, in cases where it has been heartily and genially received, for which, in our judgment, it has never yet had sufficient credit: its tendency to give suppleness and elasticity of mind; to produce the readiest and surest learners of the various occupations of life in all their shapes. In the case of Bishop Patteson, the difficulty really is to point out not all the things he did, but any things which he was not able and wont to do. An adept in early life at games, exercises, and amusements, he turned his gift of corporal versatility thus acquired to handicraft and labour of all kinds. Saint Paul, the tent-maker, lived in a civilized age and in civilized countries, and never could have been put under the straining tests of this class which were constantly applied to Bishop Patteson. Almost amphibious as between land and water, he became, while disliking the physical conditions of sea-life, a hardy seaman and an accomplished navigator. When ashore he was farmer, gardener, woodman, porter, carpenter, tailor, cook, or anything else that necessity demanded and his large experience taught. In higher regions of exertion he was, amidst the severest trials of epidemic dysentery or typhus, or in the crisis of some dangerous visit to an untried island, physician, surgeon, and the tenderest of nurses, all in one; without ever intermitting his sleepless activity in the most personal duties of a pastor, or the regular maintenance of the more public offices of religion, or abating his readiness to turn to that which was evidently the most laborious and exacting of all his duties, the duty of the schoolmaster, engaged upon the double work of opening the understanding of his pupils and of applying the mental instrument thus improved to the perception, and reception, of Christian truth.

Of his purely intellectual gifts, there can be little doubt that one was pre-eminent. He possessed, in a degree that must have placed at his command the highest distinction had he remained in Europe, the gift of languages, both in its practical and in its scientific sense. In the first eighteen months, or thereabouts (ii. 581), as he reports to his friend Professor Max Müller, he had become acquainted in various degrees with five of the Oceanic languages; but in his closing years, we are assured on the high authority of Sir W. Martin, himself no mean philologist, he spoke no less a number of them than twenty-three (ii. 590). He had prepared and printed, it appears (ii. 529), elementary grammars of thirteen, and general vocabularies of three; had executed considerable translations from portions of the Scripture, and had rendered hymns in the tongue of Mota, which, remarks Sir W. Martin, 'are described to me by competent judges as of singular

singular excellence' (ii. 590). Also Psalms ; of which Mr. Codrington observes that they are 'as lofty in their diction, and as harmonious in their rhythm, in my judgment, as anything, almost, I read in any language' (ii. 416). And he had comprehensively considered, as appears from many passages in his letters, the principles, on which the numerous tongues of that region might be placed in mutual relation. Mr. Max Müller has himself borne warm testimony to the great attainments and capacities of his friend. It is, we fear, too true, that much knowledge not to be reclaimed, and much hope for the progress of the important science of comparative philology, lie buried with him in the silent depths of the Pacific.

But 'onward' and 'upward' were the inseparable laws of his life ; and through his great gift of tongues his mind passed on to consider the general relations of thought and language, the law of growth in power of expression to which language itself is subject, and its necessary imperfection as the medium through which truth is commonly presented to the human understanding. This tendency of his mind gives an additional interest to the views which he took of current ecclesiastical affairs, and of the controversies of the day beyond his own immediate sphere. In approaching this part of our subject, it may be right to begin with an endeavour to apprehend his own standing-point.

Bishop Patteson was eminently, and entirely, an English Churchman. He believed in the historical Church of Christ, in the foundation by the Redeemer of a society of men, which was to endure throughout all time, and was to be, and to be known as, the grand depositary of religious truth and grace, and the main instrument for their communication to mankind. The Church is 'a Divine institution, the mystical Body of the Lord, on which all graces are bestowed, and through whose ministrations men are trained in holiness and truth' (ii. 387). Not less firmly did he believe that the English Reformation was a reform and not a revolution, lying within the proper competency of the local Church, and aiming, in the matters wherein it departed from current usage and opinion, at an honest recurrence to the principles and practice of the primitive and not yet disunited Christian Church. In this important respect Bishop Patteson precisely corresponded with another great Bishop of the English Church, Bishop Wilberforce, whose character and services we recently endeavoured to portray, and whose name never can grow pale upon the page of our Church History.

But while he was thus, in the best and truest sense of the word, an Anglican, like his distinguished father the Judge, and while he must rank among the prime honours of the name, the ductile

ductile and thoughtful character of his mind preserved him from all rigidity and narrowness. His indulgence in judgment of men would, we have no doubt, have overleapt all boundaries of opinion. With books and thoughts his sympathies, as was right, had their limits: but in his appreciation of our living writers on Scripture, we find him combining the names of Pusey, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Vaughan, Trench, Wordsworth, Alford, and others, as men from whom he drew copious and varied instruction in the main subject of his theological studies, the text of Holy Scripture. But further, on the performances of what is called modern thought in religion he looked with a wise circumspection and jealousy, yet also with a considerate sympathy, and while he deplored the precipitancy and levity of the age, he recognised, and even could enjoy and commend, its earnestness. The following passage is extracted from a letter to his brother:—

‘I read very little indeed, except books on theology, and critical books on the Bible and on languages. \*Of course I am following with more and more interest the theological questions of the day. I quite see that much good may (D.V.) result from the spirit of enquiry. It is recklessly and irreverently conducted by many. But no one can deny that great misconceptions prevail as to the Bible—the object, I mean, with which it was given, the true use of much of it, the necessity of considering the circumstances (political, social, &c.) of the people to whom at different periods of their national life portions of it were given.

‘The proportion and analogy of the Divine revelation are often overlooked. A passage applicable to the old state of rude Jewish society is transferred *totidem verbis*, and in the same application, to the needs of Christian men; whereas the principle is, indeed, the same, because God is ever the same, and the spiritual needs of man, and the constitution of man’s nature the same, but the application of the principle must needs vary.

‘It requires constant prayer and guidance from above to bring out of one’s treasure things new and old. And it is most difficult, because men rashly solve the difficulty by introducing the notion of a “verifying faculty” in each man, by which he is supposed to be competent to discriminate between what is of universal and what is of partial value in the Bible.

‘All these questions have, naturally, an exceeding interest for me, and I read with eagerness all such books as I can get hold of which bear on such matters.

‘The movement is not one which ought to be, if it could be, suppressed. There is an element of good in it; and on this the true Churchman ought to fasten, thankfully recognising and welcoming it, and drawing the true inference. We can’t suppose that men in the nineteenth century will view the questions as they did in the sixteenth or seventeenth. No one century exactly resembles another. We must

not seek simply to reproduce what to any of us may appear to be a golden age of theological literature and thought. Men must be dealt with as they are.'—Vol. ii. pp. 147–8.

As the Colonial Church, since the movement commenced by Archbishop Howley in 1840, has on one side done so much to exhibit true vitality in the English Church, so it has on the other given occasion to perhaps its greatest pain and scandal in the publications and proceedings of Bishop Colenso; whose case stands in such a startling contrast with that of his neighbour, Bishop Mackenzie, a too early victim of fondly devoted zeal. We do not presume to weigh each of Bishop Colenso's particular opinions; but it is difficult to doubt from his writings that he has unconsciously passed under the dominion of what may be termed the destructive spirit. Most unhappily, he only discovered in conference with a Zulu what he ought, as a Christian teacher and a Bishop, to have known long before; and, fluttered and surprised, he thought it his duty to deliver to the world in all their crudity those notions of a neophyte in criticism which a trained and instructed theologian would have been able to purge, limit, and reduce, and then to find their proper place for. With himself it is probable that the unseemly schism he has created will pass away. But to Bishop Patteson his works, and the notoriety they had attained through his Episcopal title and office, were a sore and standing affliction. 'Sadder, far sadder than aught else, is the case of Bishop Colenso' (ii. 22). This was in 1862. He frequently recurs to the subject;\* and he forms a very mean estimate of Bishop Colenso's critical acumen and fidelity. But even here he derives thoughts of solace from the reason of the case:—

'Of course it will do great harm. At the same time the Church of the last century, in a state of lethargy, could not have produced the men of active thought, energy, and boldness, which must sometimes, alas! develop themselves in a wrong direction.'—Vol. ii. p. 32.

Nor can there be a better example of considerate handling in these delicate matters than the following passage, drawn from him by the unfortunate volume known as 'Essays and Reviews':—

'I hope that men, especially Bishops, who don't know and can't understand Jowett, won't attempt to write against him. A man must know Jowett, be behind the curtain, know what he means by the phraseology he uses. He is answerable, perhaps, for not being intelligible to the world at large; but I am sure that not above one out of fifty readers will have much notion of what he really means to say,

\* Vol. ii. pp. 31, 69, 78, 117, 171, 192–3.

and only that one can do any good by entering into a discussion. I confess it strikes me that grievous as are many opinions that I fear he undoubtedly holds, his essays are eminently suggestive—the essays appended to and intermixed with his Commentaries, and that it needs delicate handling to eliminate what is true and useful from the error with which it is associated. Anyhow he deals with questions openly and boldly, which men wiser or less honest have ignored, consciously ignored before. And I pray God some one may be found to show wisely and temperately to the intellectual portion of the community the true way to solve these difficulties and answer these questions. Simple denunciation, or the reassertion of our own side of the question, or the assigning our meaning and ideas to his words, will not do it.—Vol. i. p. 542.\*

But he was as fearless as he was considerate: and that he was no slave to merely popular modes of statement, may be shown by a very interesting passage on the Atonement; one written, too, within that last period of his life, during which he seems to have attained to a yet clearer insight into the world he was so soon to enter. It is dated July 31, 1871:—

‘There is no doubt that Matthew Arnold says much that is true of the narrowness, bigotry, and jealous unchristian temper of Puritanism; and I suppose no one doubts that they do misrepresent the true doctrine of Christianity, both by their exclusive devotion to one side only of the teaching of the Bible, and by their misconception of their own favourite portions of Scripture. The doctrine of the Atonement was never in ancient times, I believe, drawn out in the form in which Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and others have lately stated it.

‘The fact of the Atonement through the Death of Christ was always clearly stated; the manner, the “*why*,” the “*how*” man’s Redemption and Reconciliation to God is thus brought about, was not taught, if at all, after the Protestant fashion.

‘Oxenham’s “History of the Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement” is a fairly-written statement of what was formerly held and taught. Such words as “substitution,” “satisfaction,” with all the ideas introduced into the subject from the use of illustrations, *e.g.*, of criminals acquitted, debts discharged, have perplexed, perhaps, rather than explained, what must be beyond explanation.

‘The ultra-Calvinistic view becomes in the mind and language of the hot-headed ignorant fanatic a denial of God’s Unity. “The merciful Son appeasing the wrath of the angry Father,” is language which implies two Wills, two Counsels in the Divine Mind (compare with this John iii. 16).’—Vol. ii. pp. 535–6.

The opinions and feelings of such a man with reference to the particular contentions at home, of which the din is ever in our ears, cannot but be full of interest. His gentle voice, which

\* Compare vol. ii. p. 297



never sounded in the tones of wrath or bitterness, cannot but soothe and soften us when whispering from his grave. Unfortunately, with the methods of partial investigation and extravagant interpretation, which are in vogue, it would not be impossible to convict Bishop Patteson, from isolated passages, either of Ritualism or its direct reverse. One of the commonest of all vulgar errors is to mistake warmth of heart and feeling, and that directness of impression which is allied with sincerity of character, for violence of opinion. All that Bishop Patteson loved, he loved fervently. And he loved the old Cathedral service (ii. 200). He loved Church-ornamentation, such as he could practise it.

‘Our chapel is beautifully decorated. A star at the east end, over the word Emmanuel, all in golden everlasting flame, with lilies and oleanders; in front, of young Norfolk Island pines and evergreens.’—Vol. ii. p. 436 (*compare* pp. 200, 291, 345).

It is to be borne in mind that the structural baldness of the rude edifices, in which he had to officiate, rather urgently demanded the use of embellishment to establish that severance of character which most would admit to be requisite in a religious edifice. His aspirations, however, went farther than his practice.

‘Sometimes I have a vision—but I must live twenty years to see more than a vision—of a small but exceedingly beautiful Gothic chapel, rich inside with marbles and stained glass and carved stalls and encaustic tiles and brass screen work. I have a feeling that a certain use of really good ornaments may be desirable, and being on a very small scale, it might be possible to make a very perfect thing some day. There is no notion of my indulging such a thought. It may come some day, and most probably long after I am dead and gone. It would be very foolish to spend money upon more necessary things than a beautiful chapel at present, when in fact I barely pay my way at all. And yet a really noble church is a wonderful instrument of education, if we think only of the lower way of regarding it.’—Vol. ii. p. 79.

But besides his having, as is plain, a very true and strong æsthetic faculty, Bishop Patteson was a man whose intensely devotional spirit entitled him, so to speak, to desire beauties both of edifice and ritual, which to common men might be dead forms, but which for him would only be well-proportioned appendages and real aids. ‘I see and love the beauty of the outward form, when it is known and felt to be no more than the shrine of the inward spiritual power’ (ii. 373). At the same time it is undeniable, that of what is known in England by the name of Ritualism he distinctly disapproved. In 1866, he writes to a sister as follows:—

‘It

‘It is all wrong, Fan. Functions don’t promote the Catholic spirit of the Church, nor aid the Eastern and Western Churches to regard us as Catholic. Oh! how we need to pray for the spirit of wisdom, and understanding, and counsel, and knowledge! And even if these things are right, why must men be so impatient? Fifty years hence it may be that to resist some such movement might be evidently “to fight against God.” But that a vestment, or incense, or genuflections, albeit once in use, are of the essence of Christianity, no one ventures to say. . . .

‘There is a symbolism about the vestments, I admit, possibly of some value to about one in every thousand of our Church people, but not in such vestments as men now are using, which, to 999 in every 1000, symbolise only Rome. The next is Mediævalism: and if the Church of England accepts Mediæval rather than Primitive usage, I, for one, don’t know how she is to answer the Romanists.’—Vol. ii. p. 214.\*

Neither indeed, in the high matter of Eucharistic doctrine, did he completely accompany the man for whom, of all living men, he seems to have had the deepest and most affectionate reverence. We do not wish to enter into the theological details of this lofty subject. As far as we are able to understand and harmonise the numerous references to it, he appears to have detected a decided tendency to materialism in the idea of a localised presence (ii. 409), and thinks he finds in Mr. Keble’s ‘Eucharistical Adoration,’ a foreign rather than an English tone (ii. 472). He hesitates, even at the idea and phrase of the ‘continuation’ of the sacrifice of the Cross: while, on the other hand, he regrets that the ‘sacrificial aspect of the rite has for a length of time been almost wholly lost sight of’ (ii. 430). He speaks favourably of the teaching of Dr. Waterland. But what is most touching to observe is the strife in his mind between the desire, on the one hand, to walk in the tradition of his fathers, and maintain a healthy tone together with the balanced order of the truth; and, on the other hand, his constantly recurring reluctance to believe that such a man as John Keble could be wrong (ii. 265, 299), and the strong action of his habitual self-mistrust.

To the position of the Colonial Church in its independence of the State, and its dependence on voluntary alms, he had thoroughly wedded and fitted himself, and this not as matter of necessity, but apparently with full contentment of heart and understanding. He saw in its actual play the machinery of Church government, such as it had been organised by Bishop Selwyn: he nowhere charges it with insufficiency or inconvenience. Indeed he looks with what may be described as a

---

\* Compare pp. 234, 244, 298.

generous compassion upon the difficulties of the Church in England. 'I can well see how we in New Zealand should deal with such difficulties, as are presented by Ritualism, *e.g.*; but in England the Church seems powerless' (ii. 233). He speaks with as much severity as his kindly nature would allow of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under the guidance of Lord Westbury. 'We have no desire to send appeals to Lord Westbury and C<sup>o</sup>.' 'We accept the Supremacy, as Wesleyans, Baptists, &c., accept it. I don't see in what other sense we can accept it' (ii. 235). Excesses in the Church at home he thinks are due to the want of a government, which in the Colonies they have. The Privy Council, in his opinion, exercises no moral influence. But with Diocesan Synods, including lay and clerical representatives in equal numbers, he thinks a mere fraction would be found to vote in the sense of Ritualism (ii. 245), so that free self-government would heal the sore.\* The experience of the Colonial Churches may, he thinks, be supplying precedents for the authorities at home in the great change that must come (ii. 236).

Thus strong in faith and love, happy in a balanced mind, and armed at all points against evil, did this manly and truly English Bishop exercise his mind continually on the problems of the day during those hours which were not appropriated to some of the multifarious duties of his own sphere; and prove himself to be 'the man of God, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.'

Even on common affairs he would appear to have been a shrewd and gifted observer. In January, 1867, when nothing had occurred to give token of any great coming change, he boldly prophesies 'Ireland,' *i.e.* the Irish Church, 'will soon be disestablished' (*ibid.*). So, speaking of France. 'The Empire seems almost systematically to have completed the demoralisation of the people' (ii. 498). And of all important events reported to him from home, however morally remote from his own sphere of action, he never fails to take a truly human and sympathetic notice.

Again, but shortly after the agonising distress of the Santa-Cruz massacre, he learns from a sister that she is going to Ger-

---

\* It is certainly remarkable, and is very little to our credit, that while Parliament and the country have been so much excited during the present year on the subject of clergy discipline, and we are told that this excitement has been but a sample and foretaste of what is to follow in future years, the Anglican Church in New Brunswick, under the excellent Bishop Medley, has been able quietly and with general satisfaction to adjust a method for trying all complaints and causes against clergymen; and has even added provisions for repelling from the Holy Communion lay-people of notoriously evil life. See the very interesting 'Journal of the Third Session of the Diocesan Synod of Fredericton.' Fredericton, New Brunswick, 1873.

many, and is at once touched in his domestic sympathies. 'So, old Fan, you are again in Germany, at Aix, at Dresden. Oh, how I should like to be with you there' (ii. 113).

We shall now pass to the last division of the work, and the last period of the Bishop's life. It is marked, as regards himself, by severe pain and protracted uneasiness, with depression of vital force; and it is lightened up by previsions of some coming crisis, and by glimpses into the future that awaited him beyond the grave. It also presents to us in a marked manner the real growth of his missionary work, the increasing ripeness of his coadjutors, the larger numbers and greater vitality of scholars and of converts. But along with this is now opened to us more fully another and a hideous picture, on the features of which it is no less necessary than it is painful for us to dwell.

Scarcely had the West African slave-trade been suppressed, and the death-knell of slavery itself sounded in America and the West Indies (it having there now no legal existence except in Cuba), when a fresh call was made upon the philanthropic energies of Great Britain, in order to deal with a like evil on the coast of Eastern Africa. That call has not been unheeded; and both diplomacy and force have been employed with some success in the prosecution of the work of repression. In this instance, the Empire of the Queen has provided many or most of the guilty carriers; but the demand at least, which has called forth the supply, has not been British.

The last few years have developed a new mischief, to which we are more nearly related. The climate of the young colony of Queensland has created a demand for coloured labour in order to develop the great capacities of that region for raising tropical or semi-tropical productions. And the reckless cupidity, or dashing enterprise, or both, of our countrymen, has poured British settlers, now some thousands in number, into the Fiji Islands; not less than seventy of which (out of a total number which has been stated at 200), are inhabited by a race who were, until a few years ago, reputed to be fiercely cannibal, but of whom a very large number have been brought within the pale of a Christian profession by the efforts of Wesleyan missionaries. But here also, with a view to the production of sugar and coffee, a desire for coloured labour has arisen far beyond what the islands can supply. And this circumstance opens to us the darkest part of the whole prospect. In Queensland, the Colonial Government (ii. 425) has made local laws for the purpose of checking that portion of the grievous evils engendered by the labour traffic, which have their seat within the colony. In Fiji  
we

we much fear the prevailing tone is lower, the settlers of an inferior stamp: there is no Government which can be held really responsible; and what is worst perhaps of all, the nature of the territory, the abundance of secluded sites (ii. 445), and of waters difficult or impossible of access to Queen's ships, will probably offer insurmountable obstacles to the enforcement of stringent regulations with respect to the admission of imported labour. It may be recollected, that in the single island of Mauritius, the introduction of slaves was practised for years and years after the legal abolition of the slave-trade; as was virtually admitted by Mr. Irvine, the representative of the Mauritian planters at a later date, in his place in Parliament.

To make provision for good government, and for the purposes of philanthropy, in the Fiji Islands, it has been seriously proposed by Mr. Macarthur, M.P., a fervid Wesleyan, that the British people shall, from the other extremity of the globe, undertake their government and police; and the Administration are engaged, with no light responsibility, in considering whether there are conditions on which this can be done. In the time of the late Ministry, the Australian Colonies recommended the measure, but when it was pointed out that this was rather a duty for them, under the circumstances, to undertake, that they had greatly superior facilities for its performance, and that the full countenance and moral support of the Home Government would be afforded them, the suggestion was rather warmly repudiated; so the political problem remains, awaiting its solution.

And a very arduous problem it is. But its difficulties are light as air, compared with those which this mischievous traffic is, we fear, certain to create beyond the borders both of Queensland and of the Fiji Islands. From this point of view, indeed, the case is not merely serious but, possibly or even probably, hopeless. And its constantly disturbing features clouded the last years of Bishop Patteson, and extinguished the bright light of his presence among the Melanesian Islands.

Should the islands become part of the British Empire, settlers will multiply, new capital will be invested, and more labourers will be required. The labour traffic will be extended; the police of those seas will also be enlarged, at great cost to the people of this country; but it will be for the regulation, not the extinction, of the enlarged traffic, and of that enlargement no improved police can possibly neutralise the mischief.

From the tragical connection of this subject with Bishop Patteson, it comes about that the concluding portion of Miss Yonge's work is largely occupied with the painful topic, and it is also the subject of two able papers in the Appendix by the  
Bishop's

Bishop's valued friend and able coadjutor, Mr. Codrington. We proceed to collect from the work before us a general statement of the case.

A traffic of this kind does not begin in an abstract love of violence and cruelty, but in designs of gain, prosecuted under circumstances which present incessant and strong temptation, with feeble and rare restraint. Thus, full of lubricity at the best, it is certain to deviate and degenerate into the most fearful mischiefs; and the very efforts of police made for its regulation, and requiring rough and summary methods, often tend at once to drive the trade into the worst and most reckless hands. The Bishop, whose practical turn is as remarkable as the elevation of his ideas on every subject, proposed that only licensed vessels, with proper agents on board, should be allowed to convey labourers at all, and that every vessel not so licensed and provided should at once be confiscated (ii. 439, *et alibi*). Why no such measure has been adopted we are unable to say.

As the matter stands, we are first encountered by the fact that the Melanesian Islander does not live in an organised political society, but in what is termed the savage life. He is thus deprived of the natural protection which anything like a government would afford him in making an agreement which is to narrow his liberty, and pledge his labour. Then it is admitted that no labourer should go except under contract; but can the term contract be other than an impenetrable mystery to such a man, invited to leave his country and enter into what is for him an unknown existence in an unknown land, and to bind himself during a term of years, when his thoughts have scarcely gone beyond the passing day? There are no interpreters, that is, no persons comprehending the two languages, from which and into which they interpret. No European who has studied the languages of the islands is ever employed in the trade (ii. 443). The native interpreters are 'invariably untrustworthy,' 'ready with any lying story to induce natives to leave their homes.' The vast majority know neither where they are going, nor among whom, nor for what (ii. 438). The very best that can happen is that they should go willingly, and return at the end of their term. But what then? What experience have they had in the interval? Hear Mr. Codrington (ii. 596):—

'These Melanesian labourers have in very many cases been taken away from direct missionary teaching; are still heathen, because carried into a Christian land! Very many others would now be approached by the Gospel, which is ready to spread among their former homes, but does not reach them, because they are living among a Christian people.'

And

And we see the consequences, described by the Bishop :—

‘ Any of these natives that may be taken back to his island will be sure to do harm. Under such circumstances, the South Sea Islander acquires all the low vulgar vices of the worst class of white men, and becomes of course demoralised, and the source of demoralisation to his people. Any respectable traveller among ignorant or wild races will tell you the same thing.’—Vol. ii. p. 501.

Probably no great number will thus return ; even a few, however, will be so many centres of mischief. What, then, is the other alternative ? The depopulation of the islands. In this instance, very large drafts are made, from a very large field of demand, upon an extremely narrow field of supply. Mr. Codrington points out (ii. 600) that the population is (there appear to be some rare exceptions) already insufficient to keep up the cultivation ; that from the withdrawal of the able-bodied, follows the contraction of the area, and then, through an insufficient supply of food, the death of the aged, the weak, and the children. ‘ From this cause, as your Excellency has been informed, large tracts in Melanesia have already returned to the primitive wilderness.’

All this is apart from the outrages and abuses by which this traffic and the names of England and of Christendom have been and are disgraced. Where the limited number of those really willing to go is exhausted, others must be had. When, in some of the islands, the people gradually come to an inkling of what they are about, and begin to raise their terms, the ship-masters go ‘ further north ’ (ii. 599). Now comes the turn of fraud and force. The natives are inveigled on board to look at axes or tobacco ; the hatches are then fastened down upon them : or they are told, with an incredible baseness, by these wretches and pests of their kind, in quest of their loathsome gains, that the Bishop, unable to come himself, has sent them to bring natives to him.

‘ His ship had been wrecked, he had broken his leg, he had gone to England, and sent them to fetch natives to him.’—Vol. ii. p. 368.

‘ In the Banks Islands, in every case, they took people away under false pretences, asserting that the Bishop is ill and can’t come, he has sent us to bring you to him.’—Vol. ii. p. 380.

‘ Sometimes even a figure was placed on deck, dressed in a black coat, with a book in his hand, according to the sailor’s notion of a missionary, to induce the natives to come on deck ; and then they were clapped under hatches and carried off.’—Vol. ii. p. 426.

The next step to this base decoying was violence outright and *ab initio* :—

‘ But decoying without violence began to fail ; the natives were becoming too cautious, so the canoes were upset, and the men picked up while

while struggling in the water. If they tried to resist, they were shot at, and all endeavours at a rescue were met with the use of firearms.

‘They were thus swept off in such numbers, that small islands lost almost all their able-bodied inhabitants, and were in danger of famine for want of their workers. Also, the Fiji planters, thinking to make the men happier by bringing their wives, desired that this might be done, but it was not easy to make out the married couples, nor did the crews trouble themselves to do so, but took any woman they could lay hands on. Husbands pursued to save the wives, and were shot down, and a deadly spirit of hatred and terror against all that was white was aroused.’—Vol. ii. p. 427.

A ship of this description is known among the islanders as a ‘snatch-snatch,’ or ‘thief-ship’ (ii. 517). But, strange to say, the tortoise-shell trade appears to be blackened with a yet deeper guilt, as it is believed (ii. 427) that some of the traders carry their customers in pursuit of enemies, whose skulls are a common trophy in the more savage islands.

We cannot wonder that in such a state of things the service of the Missionary Bishop should be a service of danger; but what we much fear is that, in the final issue, gain will be too much both for humanity and for the British Navy, and that, under its fearful power to depopulate and demoralise, the race itself will pass away, and the tradition of Bishop Patteson will soon belong to a past having no link with the present. Apart, however, from this mournful speculation, let us trace the actual effects as they appear in the volumes before us.

The death of Mr. Williams at Erromango was, according to the account in this work (i. 328), due to his having unawares interfered with a solemnity which the natives were celebrating upon the beach. But it appears that, from the first, Bishop Selwyn, a spirit no less heroic than his successor whom he chose and trained, found it necessary, in and before going ashore, to watch the signs of the prevailing temper of the natives as he passed in circuit from island to island. The regular practice of both seems to have been, in all doubtful cases, to land, or rather, in most cases, to take the water for the shore alone. As early as in 1861, we have this record:—

‘As we left the little pool where I had jumped ashore, leaving, for prudence sake, the rest behind me in the boat, one man raised his bow and drew it, then unbent it, then bent it again; but apparently others were dissuading him from letting fly the arrow. The boat was not ten yards off; I don’t know why he did so.’

And the conclusion drawn is:

‘But we must try to effect more frequent landings.’—Vol. i. p. 524.

Again,



Again, about the same time :—

‘ Humanly speaking, there are not many places that as yet I am able to visit, where I realise the fact of any danger being run.

‘ Yet it may happen that some poor fellow, who has a good cause to think ill of white men, or some mischievous badly disposed man, may let fly a random arrow or spear some day.

‘ If so, you will not so very much wonder, nor be so very greatly grieved. Every clergyman, runs at least as great a risk among the small-pox and fevers of town parishes. Think of Uncle James in the cholera at Thorverton.’—Vol. i. p. 526.

It was thoroughly characteristic of his chivalrous and unselfish character thus to minimise the perils of his own sphere, to put in the foreground the palliation of any act of violence, and to magnify, for the sake of self-depreciation, the risks which the faithful pastor sometimes encounters at home. Nothing else could account for a comparison so ill fitted to the facts. Out of the eight or nine men other than Melanesians, who appear to have been engaged in the work of his itinerant apostolate, two, Young and Nobbs, fell victims (and the Bishop had the narrowest possible escape) in 1864 on the fatal island of Santa Cruz ; and the Bishop himself, with Joseph Atkin, in 1871, raised the number to four. But in truth, excellent as he seems to have been in his powers of business and organisation for any ordinary purpose, he was in his island work driven on by an intensity of love to his Saviour, and to those for whom his Saviour died, such as left him little power to take into his reckoning anything that stood outside the one absorbing issue. On one occasion, when a large number of natives were assembled, and the Bishop, as usual, went ashore alone and conversed with them, Mr. Tilly, R.N., who had charge of the vessel (and who has given us an account of the Bishop, which will be read with deep interest), watched his countenance carefully in the boat, and saw it charged only with an intense expression of yearning love.

‘ After a while we took him into the boat again, and lay off the beach a few yards to be clear of the throng, and be able to get at the things he wanted to give them, they coming about the boat in canoes ; and this is the fact I wished to notice, viz., *the look on his face* while the intercourse with them lasted. I was so struck with it, quite involuntarily, for I had no idea of watching for anything of the sort ; but it was one of such extreme gentleness, and of yearning towards them.’—Vol. ii. p. 65.

But it is time for us to accompany this devoted man through the stages of the closing period.

While he had been ever trying to make little of his labours, and much of his scanty comforts, it is evident that unremitted exertion

exertion was carrying him through all the best years of his prime with great rapidity into an early old age. The incipient signs are found in playful allusions to the first grey hairs. But early in 1870 he was struck down by a severe and dangerous attack of internal inflammation. 'There was a time when I felt drawing near the dark valley' (ii. 430); and his thoughts ran upon the dearest of those who had already passed it. With darkened countenance, and frame prematurely bowed, he went to Auckland for advice; and seemed, says Lady Martin, quite a wreck, while he was striving cheerfully to describe his improvement on the voyage. The personal record of his thoughts during his illness (ii. 432) becomes even too solemn for quotation here. His ailment was declared to be chronic, not necessarily fatal, but one that, without careful treatment, might at any moment bring on a crisis. He began to be aware that there must be a change in the amount and character of his work:—

'I think I shall have to forego some of the more risky and adventurous part of the work in the islands. This is all right. It is a sign that the time is come for me to delegate it to others. I don't mean that I shall not take the voyages and stop about on the islands (D.V.) as before. But I must do it all more carefully, and avoid much that of old I never thought about.' (May 9, 1870.)—Vol. ii. p. 433.

At this period Lady Martin describes him—

'His face, always beautiful from the unworldly purity of its expression, was really as the face of an angel while he spoke of these things, and of the love and kindness he had received. He seemed to have been standing on the very brink of the river, and it was yet doubtful whether he was to abide with us. Now, looking back, we can see how mercifully God was dealing with His servant. A time of quiet and of preparation for death given to him apart from the hurry of his daily life, then a few months of active service, and then the crown.'—Vol. ii. p. 434.

He mended very slowly; but he determined to sail. The anxieties of the wretched labour-traffic weighed heavily upon him at this time. He went to Norfolk Island, and from thence to Melanesia. In September he approaches Santa Cruz, where the horizon still was charged with doom. No door had yet been opened there; but he hopes the time will come. He completed his circuit in October, and, arriving at Norfolk Island, resumed the old mapping of his day for teaching, study, and devotion, never forgetting correspondence in its turn; but with a lower level of spirits and of energy, and in the language of his loved and loving biographer, with 'already the shadow, as it were, of death upon him.' But

'From

‘ From before 5 A.M. till soon after 9 P.M., when I go off to bed quite tired, I am very seldom alone.

‘ I may do a good deal of work yet, rather in a quieter way than of old ; but then I need not have any more adventures, except at one or two places perhaps, like Santa Cruz.’—Vol. ii. p. 468.

His mind continues, however, to act with unabated interest upon all the portions of his work ; and also upon Hebrew philologically viewed, upon the events of the year at Rome and on the French frontier, upon theology. But he confesses, as usual, his faults.

‘ I think that I read too exclusively one class of books. I am not drawn out of this particular kind of reading, which is alone really pleasant and delightful to me, by meeting with persons who discuss other matters. I make dutiful efforts to read a bit of history or poetry, but it won’t do. My relaxation is in reading some old favourite—Jackson, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, &c.’—Vol. ii. p. 475.

An ordination approaches. That the whole Melanesian party may be present, the enfeebled man walks three miles up to the larger chapel at the so-called town, for a three hours’ service. As he writes to his sister before setting out, he describes the heart-searching which such an occasion brings, and deplores the selfishness ! ‘ of many long years.’

On April 27, 1871, he set out for the closing voyage. At Mota, the missionary headquarters, he recognised a great progress. Christianity had so far become a power and habit of life, that he felt warranted, notwithstanding all his strictness about the administration of baptism, in giving that sacrament to the young children. He contemplates a visit, or more than a visit, to Fiji. On a Sunday evening, a former scholar, who seemed in the interval to have forgotten all, comes to him in the dark like Nicodemus, and says :

‘ “ I have for days been watching for a chance of speaking to you alone ! Always so many people about you. My heart is so full, so hot every word goes into it, deep, deep. The old life seems a dream. Everything seems to be new. When a month ago I followed you out of the *Sala Goro*, you said that if I wanted to know the meaning and power of this teaching, I must pray ! And I tried to pray, and it becomes easier as every day I pray as I go about, and in the morning and evening ; and I don’t know how to pray as I ought, but my heart is light, and I know it’s all true, and my mind is made up, and I have been wanting to tell you, and so is Sogoinowut, and we four talk together, and all want to be baptised.” ’—Vol. ii. pp. 523–4.

In July he leaves this island, where so deep a root had been struck, after baptizing 289 persons, and goes among the islands. His experience is generally pleasant ; but it is chequered by  
rumours

rumours of crime, and of retaliation for crime, in connection with the labour traffic. Returning to Mota, he records a concourse of people flocking to be taught. 'I sleep on a table: people under and around it' (ii. 533, 541). Such was the nightly preparation of the invalid for his long, laborious, uncomplaining days. Here, on the 6th of August, we have several most thoughtful pages on difficulties of theology. 'How thankful I am that I am far away from the noise\* and worry of this sceptical yet earnest age' (ii. 542). Sailing on the 20th, he sends to Bishop Abraham (ii. 546) a most interesting summary of the state of things at Mota. The Bishops, his brethren in New Zealand, jointly urged him to go to England, but he declined. The labour traffic still casts a dark shadow across his path. 'I hear that a vessel has gone to Santa Cruz, and I must be very cautious there, for there has been some disturbance almost to a certainty' (ii. 557).

And now, on September 16th, he finds himself off the Santa-Cruz group.

'I pray God that if *it be His will*, and if *it be the appointed time*, He may enable us in His own way to begin some little work among these very wild but vigorous energetic islanders. I am fully alive to the probability that some outrage has been committed here by one or more vessels. The master of the vessel that Atkin saw did not deny his intention of taking away from these, or from any other island, any men or boys he could induce to come on board. I am quite aware that we *may* be exposed to considerable risk on this account. I trust that all may be well; that if it be His will that any trouble should come upon us, dear Joseph Atkin, his father and mother's only son, may be spared. But I don't think there is very much cause for fear; first, because at these small reef islands they know me pretty well, though they don't understand as yet our object in coming to them, and they may very easily connect us white people with the other white people who have been ill-using them; second, last year I was on shore at Nukapu and Pitini for some time, and I can talk somewhat with the people; third, I think that if any violence has been used to the natives of the north face of the large island, Santa-Cruz, I shall hear of it from these inhabitants of the small islets to the north, Nukapu and Pitini, and so be forewarned.'—Vol. ii. p. 560.

Accordingly, to Nukapu he went. Four canoes were seen, hovering about the coral reef which surrounded the island. The vessel had to feel her way; so, lest the men in the canoes should be perplexed, he ordered the boat to be lowered, and when asked to go into one of the native boats, as this was always found a good mode of disarming suspicion,\* he did it, and was carried off towards the shore. The boat from the schooner could

---

\* See vol. ii. p. 78.

not get over the reef. The Bishop was seen to land on the beach, and was seen no more alive. But after a while, the islanders in the canoes began to discharge arrows at the crew of the boat, and Mr. Atkin was struck, with two others. The arrow-head of human bone was extracted from him, and, the tide now rising, in spite of suffering and weakness, he crossed the reef to seek the Bishop. A canoe drifted towards them: the body of a man was seen as if crouching in it.

‘As they came up with it, and lifted the bundle wrapped in matting into the boat, a shout or yell arose from the shore. Watè says four canoes put off in pursuit; but the others think their only object was to secure the now empty canoe as it drifted away. The boat came alongside, and two words past, “The body!” Then it was lifted up, and laid across the skylight, rolled in the native mat, which was secured at the head and feet. The placid smile was still on the face; there was a palm leaf fastened over the breast, and when the mat was opened there were five wounds, no more.

‘The wounds were, one evidently given with a club, which had shattered the right side of the skull at the back, and probably was the first, and had destroyed life instantly, and almost painlessly; another stroke of some sharp weapon had cloven the top of the head; the body was also pierced in one place; and there were two arrow wounds in the legs, but apparently not shot at the living man, but stuck in after his fall, and after he had been stripped, for the clothing was gone, all but the boots and socks. In the front of the cocoa-nut palm, there were five knots made in the long leaflets. All this is an almost certain indication that his death was the vengeance for five of the natives. “Blood for blood” is a sacred law, almost of nature, wherever Christianity has not prevailed, and a whole tribe is held responsible for the crime of one. Five men in Fiji are known to have been stolen from Nukapu; and probably their families believed them to have been killed, and believed themselves to be performing a sacred duty when they dipped their weapons in the blood of the Bisopè, whom they did not know well enough to understand that he was their protector. Nay, it is likely that there had been some such discussion as had saved him before at Mai from suffering for Peterè’s death; and, indeed, one party seem to have wished to keep him from landing, and to have thus solemnly and reverently treated his body.

‘Even when the tidings came in the brief uncircumstantial telegram, there were none of those who loved and revered him who did not feel that such was the death he always looked for, and that he had willingly given his life. There was peace in the thought, even while hearts trembled with dread of hearing of accompanying horrors; and when the full story arrived, showing how far more painless his death had been than had he lived on to suffer from his broken health, and how wonderfully the unconscious heathen had marked him with emblems so sacred in our eyes, there was thankfulness and joy even to the bereaved at home.

‘The sweet calm smile preached peace to the mourners who had  
lost

lost his guiding spirit, but they could not look on it long. The next morning, St. Matthew's Day, the body of John Coleridge Patteson was committed to the waters of the Pacific, his "son after the faith," Joseph Atkin, reading the Burial Service.'—Vol. ii. pp. 569–71.

We have not space to dwell on the slaughter of Stephen Taroaniara, a native companion of the Bishop, faithful like him unto death; but we must devote a few lines to following the fate of Mr. Atkin, his well-beloved son in the ministry, and alas! the only son of his own mourning parents. He read the Funeral Office over the Bishop. On the 24th he celebrated the Holy Communion. During the celebration, his tongue faltered over some of the words. He at once recognised the sign of doom. He met it on the morning of the 29th, with a mind contented in death, as it had been gallant, wise, and good in life, but with a body racked and stiffened by the horrors of tetanus.

The tearful history of so much nobleness now draws to its close; and we have to bid farewell to a life which was one of the few lives, in our time, touching the ideal. We will cite the touching words of a native convert, which the biographer has chosen to mark the conclusion of her work.

'As he taught, he confirmed his word with his good life among us, as we all know; and also that he perfectly well helped anyone who might be unhappy about anything, and spoke comfort to him about it; and about his character and conduct, they are consistent with the law of God. He gave the evidence of it in his practice, for he did nothing carelessly, lest he should make anyone stumble and turn from the good way; and again he did nothing to gain anything for himself alone, but he sought what he might keep others with, and then he worked with it: and the reason was his pitifulness and his love. And again, he did not despise anyone, nor reject anyone with scorn, whether it were a white or a black person he thought them all as one, and he loved them all alike.'—Vol. ii. p. 579.

We are fully conscious that no summary can do justice to the character and career of Bishop Patteson, as they are exhibited in a work like this. But we trust that enough of its contents have been given to set forth an outline of the man, and to prompt our readers to learn for themselves how it was filled in. We shall endeavour to sum up what he was in few words; sensible, nevertheless, that to those who have studied the picture, they will convey no lights unexpected or new, and that, to those who have not, they must savour of exaggeration. In him were singularly combined the spirit of chivalry, the glorious ornament of a bygone time; the spirit of charity, rare in every age; and the spirit of reverence, which the favourite children of this generation appear to have combined to ban. It is

hardly possible to read the significant, but modest, record of his sacrifices, his labours, his perils, and his cares, without being vividly reminded of St. Paul, the prince and model of all missionary labourers; without feeling that the Apostolic pattern is not even now without its imitators, and that the copy in this case well and truly, and not remotely, recalls the original. Miss Yonge in touching words has observed that his wounds, like those of One greater than he, were five, probably in revenge for five murdered natives: and who in the records of the Church has more nobly won his *stigmata*? With a commendable reserve, she refrains from calling his death a martyrdom; yet, though the manslayer may have only been committing an act of revenge open to much palliation, it was in the strictest and most literal sense a death for Christ and for His Gospel; suffered once, courted a hundred times by a man, who for years had borne his life in his hand, as he went upon his errand of true 'sweetness and light,' of mercy and of peace. The three highest titles that can be given to man are those of martyr, hero, saint; and which of the three is there that in substance it would be irrational to attach to the name of John Coleridge Patteson? To the country which owned him he was an honour; for the Church which formed him he was a token of high powers, and a pledge of noble destinies. Thankfully indeed might she commend him to his rest:—

'Vattene in pace, alma beata o bella.'\*

---

\* 'Orlando Furioso,' xxix. 27.

A wayside cross has been erected to the memory of the Bishop, near Alfrington, by Lord Coleridge, as we are informed, with the following beautiful inscription:—

**In Memory of**

JOHN COLERIDGE PATTESON, D.D., MISSIONARY BISHOP,  
Born in London, 1 April, 1827,

Killed at Nukapu, near the Island of Santa Cruz,  
20 September, 1871,

Together with two fellow-workers for our Lord,  
The Reverend JOSEPH ATKIN and STEPHEN TAROANIARA  
(In vengeance for wrongs suffered at the hands of Europeans),

By savage men whom he loved,  
And for whose sake he gave up,  
Home and country,  
And friends dearer than his life.

—

Lord Jesus  
Grant that we may live to Thee like him,  
And stand in our lot with him  
Before Thy Throne  
At the end of the days.—Amen.

A kinsman desires  
Thus to keep alive for aftertime  
The memory of a wise, a holy,  
And a humble man.

- ART. VII.—1. *The English Peasantry*. By Francis George Heath. London, 1874.  
 2. *The Seven Ages of a Village Pauper*. By George C. T. Bartley. London, 1874.  
 3. *The Revolt of the Field*. By Arthur Clayden. London, 1874.  
 4. *Murray's Handbook of the Eastern Counties*. London, 1870.

THE strikes and lock-outs of the last few\* months, occurring for the most part in the Eastern Counties, have brought that corner of the Kingdom into somewhat more prominence than it usually assumes.

Norfolk and Suffolk, or East Anglia properly so called, lying as they do in a kind of back-water out of the way of the stream of intercourse which connects London and the South with Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham and the manufacturing districts, are comparatively unvisited, and, although containing many objects of interest, are much less known than most other parts of England.

The railways which intersect the Eastern Counties are proverbial for the slowness of their trains, the inconveniences of their principal termini, and their abstinence from the wholesome and not unusual practice of paying dividends.

Owing to the absence of coal and the deficiency of water power, there are hardly any manufactures except that of agricultural implements. A few silk-mills, a decreasing amount of silk-weaving, a few paper-mills, a manufacture of shoes, some local breweries and a tolerably extensive malting trade, make up the sum of such enterprise; and the dulness of even the largest towns, except on market day, appears in curious contrast to the teeming and swarming activity of what are usually called the 'hives of British industry.'

There is plenty of work going on nevertheless. Corn and stock farming are nowhere more successfully practised than in the Eastern Counties. The climate is dry almost to a fault, and the variety of soils enables the farmers of one part to raise wheat which vies with that of the Isle of Thanet, and of another to produce the best quality of barley grown in England; while by help of the mangold of the heavy and the turnips of the lighter and mixed-soil lands, innumerable 'yards' of bullocks are being continually made ready for the London market.\*

The isolation, however, of East Anglia existed as much in times when London and the North had comparatively little

\* It is not an unusual thing for 10,000*l.* worth of fat bullocks to be sent up in a single cattle-train from Norwich to London.



connexion, as now when three vast lines of communication are transporting goods and passengers day by day and hour by hour to and from the Metropolis. Norfolk and Suffolk practically constituted an island ; for the fen district, which cuts them off from the rest of England on the west, was not less an obstacle to intercourse than the Wash to the N.W., or the sea to the N. and E., while to the south the broad estuary of the Stour and the marshy land which runs on each side of that river after it ceases to be tidal, continued the belt of demarcation to a point not more than seven or eight miles from the S.E. corner of the Cambridgeshire fens, while part of this short distance was further blocked by the Devil's Ditch, an embankment which travellers to Newmarket can hardly fail to notice about three miles on the Cambridge side of that town.

Nor was this isolation merely topographical. The earliest accounts we possess tell us that a single British tribe, the Icenii, were the occupiers of the land ; and although they were utterly crushed in the battle after which 'the British Warrior Queen' destroyed herself, their name still remains in the Icenild Way, and probably in the word Icklingham, and the names of other villages in Suffolk. Later also, in Saxon times, the colonists as we should now term them, seem to have been more purely Teutonic, or less permanently affected by Danish inroads than those of any other part of England ; it is indeed asserted that no local Suffolk name can with any certainty be ascribed to a Danish or Norwegian origin. The speech of the people, in its intonations and its peculiar vowel sounds, differing however in different districts, gives unmistakable proof of common ancestry.\*

To this day also, an East Anglian talks, not without a shade of contempt, of an inhabitant of another county as a *sheeres* man ; and if a neighbour leaves the village and inquiry is made for him, the answer is very likely to be that it is not known where he is, but very probably he may be gone 'into the sheeres.' And thus the old habit of the Egyptians according to Herodotus and of the Greeks according to Plato,† of calling all men except themselves barbarians, is reproduced in effect, though not in words, by the inhabitants of an outlying district of our own country.

\* We may observe that no East Anglian peasant drops an *h*, and that there are consonantal as well as vowel peculiarities ; such as the pronunciation of the *t* and *th*—'now and t'en,' Essex—and of the *w*, as something between a *w* and *v*, Norfolk.

† Βαρβάρους δὲ πάντας οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καλοῦσι τοὺς μὴ σφισὶ ὁμογλώσσους.—Herodotus, ii. 158.

Τὸ μὲν Ἑλληνικὸν ὡς ἐν ἀπὸ πάντων ἀφαιρούντες χωρὶς, σύμπασι δὲ τοῖς ἔλλοις γένεσιν . . . . . Βάρβαρον μὲν κλησεῖ προσειπὼντες αὐτὸ.—Plato, *Politics*, 262, D.

There

There are perhaps few things more interesting than local peculiarities of speech. Why should the inhabitants of one district habitually and instinctively use the muscles of the mouth and tongue in such a way as to give the peculiar effect of local pronunciation to a certain set of vowels or consonants? Why, for example, should the *s* in Somersetshire be a *z*, and the double *o* of Norfolk approach to, but be not entirely identical with, the German *ö*? What, too, is that instinctive process by which words, learnt not orally but by reading, are pronounced, not as the schoolmaster or the dictionary commands, but according to the 'law' which particularises the pronunciation of similar words in habitual use in the district?

These are interesting questions, but we have neither time nor inclination to pursue them. This, however, is certain, that, as local fashions of dress are all but extinct, so local habits of language will soon follow. Manchester prints have destroyed the one, and Birmingham school-boards will abolish the other. It is not long since a Manx man left a considerable legacy for the completion of a dictionary of what is now a dead language,—the language of the Isle of Man. If the extinction of dialects goes on as rapidly as it has done during the last fifty years, the child may be already born who will live long enough to see a similar act done under similar circumstances for East Anglian speech.

Nor is it the influence of schoolmasters and pupil-teachers only that wars against the existence of dialects. Any cause, like migration or emigration, which produces a wholesale change in the *personnel* of a district, is sure to affect its dialect. The East of England had one great emigration in the seventeenth century; an emigration the linguistic effects of which are clearly traceable in the existing peculiarities of Yankee speech. If the farmers of Suffolk succeed in expatriating any considerable number of their workmen, and substitute, even in smaller masses, a mixed multitude from other parts of England, there is no doubt that East Anglian speech will fade, and ultimately disappear, before the influence of extraneous settlers, to whom other fashions of pronunciation and utterance are familiar.

It is not only the speech of East Anglia which is worthy of notice. The country abounds with curious and, in some cases, beautiful remains of Middle-Age architecture, and contains some of the best specimens of the 'brick age' of the 16th and 17th centuries. In Suffolk, Helmingham and Hengrave Halls, built in the reign of Henry VIII., and Melford Hall in that of Elizabeth, are very remarkable, as are Blickling and Barningham Halls in Norfolk. They are both of the 17th century.

Owing

Owing probably to the fact that building-stone does not exist in these counties, the nearest quarry being, we believe, in Lincolnshire, there are fewer remains of conventual buildings in East Anglia than may be met with in other parts of England. Of the great abbey at Bury St. Edmund's, for example, little now remains, except the external wall and a gate-house of rare beauty, although there is hardly an old wall in the town which has not more or less of ashlar built into it; and there can be no doubt that the vast conventual church, 300 feet long, which has almost totally disappeared, as well as the ordinary monastic buildings, were for many years after the Reformation a stone quarry for the town. Buildings for defence fared better—witness Norwich Castle and Castle Rising in Norfolk, and Framlingham Castle in Suffolk, not to mention Colchester and Hedingham castles, which are just over the border in Essex; but it is in the town and village churches that the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk are especially remarkable. One feature of these churches is almost peculiar to these two counties, the round towers, of which there are in Norfolk 125, and in Suffolk 40; the whole of the rest of England supplying only 15, of which nine are in the adjoining counties of Essex and Cambridgeshire. It has been conjectured that some of these towers existed before the introduction of Christianity, as places of refuge, like the Peels of the Border country, and had churches tacked on to them, so to speak, to which they served as belfry. Their peculiar shape is no doubt to be attributed to the fact that a square tower can hardly be built without cut stone for the quoins, whereas the flints picked off the fields and gravel-pits were applicable for round towers without addition of material which, if used, would have had to be imported from Lincolnshire. This theory, however, of the pre-Christian origin of some of these towers is hard to substantiate. It is well known that the prevalence of flint in the chalk and gravel of East Anglia has given rise to a peculiar class of masonry. Not only are untrimmed flints employed with mortar for walls, but the workman, taking advantage of the planes of cleavage, chips them with the hammer into regular cubes, which fit so exactly together that it is not possible to insert a knife between the joints. There are examples in Norfolk and Suffolk of walls so constructed, with a face as smooth as glass. The flint is also often mixed with ashlar, and this masonry, peculiar to the district, and existing nowhere else in Europe, may be seen in many of the finest Suffolk and Norfolk churches of the 15th and 16th centuries. It is said that there are no churches in Suffolk, and very few in Norfolk, which can be certainly ascribed to an earlier date than the Conquest. We have heard that on some church-doors

church-doors on the Suffolk coast, remains of leather, presumably *human*, have been found under the broad-headed nails with which such doors are studded, and it has been supposed that the skin belonged to some Danish Marsyas, flayed to 'encourage' the visits of his countrymen. But it by no means follows that the door might not have been part of an earlier structure than any now existent church. A few years since an old oak stood in the parish of Hoxne, to which St. Edmund the Martyr was, according to local tradition, bound when he was shot to death by the Danes; and if a tree existed of so great an age, there seems no reason why oak timber should not keep sound for as long a period.\*

But it is not only the smaller churches which are interesting in these counties. Some of the larger are remarkable for the curious disproportion between their size and the number of the inhabitants in the parishes to which they belong. Along the coast, both of Norfolk and Suffolk, the height of the church towers is worth notice. Like 'Boston Stump' in Lincolnshire, they are useful as sea-marks, some of them being between 150 and 200 feet high. Nor are they all tower, for it not unfrequently happens that the nave and aisles are large enough to hold the whole population, men, women, and children, so that the actual congregation is lost in the vast precincts. There is a village church on the coast of Norfolk, 120 feet long and 70 broad. We believe the congregation seldom exceeds 100 persons.

Placed, as this population has always been, apart from the high-road of national intercourse, it is not unnatural that old habits should linger long, and that even in the matter of wages the farmers should have testified more than customary unwillingness to depart, to their own detriment, from the usual tariff. The consequence has been that up to the last three or four years wages have been exceptionally low, so far as money payment is concerned. Within the last twenty years, in many parishes in Suffolk and Norfolk, the ordinary rate of Saturday night payment has not exceeded 9s. ; to this would have to be added 4d. or 6d. a day, for the services of any child of the family able to do the task of what is somewhat enigmatically termed 'keeping birds,' in other words, 'keeping them off,' for any time of the year when such services are useful, and somewhere about 5l. for the harvest work, be it for a longer or shorter duration. In the old days of reaping with the sickle, the gleaning corn was

---

\* Curiously enough, when the tree—which fell in 1849—was cut up, an arrow-head was found in the heart of it.

calculated as enough to pay the rent—that rent ranging from 3*l.* to 5*l.* Now-a-days however, what with the horse-reaper and the horse-rake, these casual accessories to wages are not so available. But it is worthy of remark that in parishes only a few miles apart, the rate of wages has been often found to be far from uniform, varying in two places not far from each other to the extent of some shillings a week, so that the averages which are given in statistical returns, such as that of the Royal Commission to which the Hon. E. Stanley belonged, and which he has summarised, and such as those contained in the Poor Law Returns, give no clear notion of the actual amount of wages in single parishes. Thus, for example, we are told that in the Samford Union, in Suffolk, wages are 11*s.* a week. But that union contains many parishes, and while in some parishes the wages might have been considerably above, in others they would be considerably below the specified amount.

These inequalities, it is quite easy to see, will henceforward rapidly diminish. The whole tendency of prices all over the country has been, and will still more distinctly in future years be, towards equality. In the remoter parts of Wales and Scotland the influence of railways and cheap postage is every year increasingly apparent; and what applies to prices in general, applies to wages in particular.

Perhaps if we could ascertain the truth with accuracy, we should find that cheap postage has had a greater effect on the social condition of the labouring classes than all other causes put together. Consider what was the position of the scattered members of a labourer's family forty years ago. Village post-offices hardly existed, and the postage of letters being according to distance, made it a matter of the most serious expense for any communication, however slight and sparse, to be kept up between parents, children, brothers, and sisters. And the worst of it was that the more dispersed the family, the greater out of all comparison the tax on intercourse. It was, in fact, a sort of prohibitive duty on family affection and parental influence; and many a poor boy and girl, who, broken off from all news of home, have been swallowed up in the nauseous vortex of city crime and city vice, might have been saved from ruin if Sir Rowland Hill's practical good sense had existed and fructified in the brain of some earlier Secretary of the Post Office.

The view, then, which is taken of the present agricultural wages contest, as of a new thing sprung from the inventive mind of a Primitive Methodist preacher, and nursed into activity by the vulgar clap-trap of persons like 'Mr. W. G. Ward,

Ward, of Peniston Towers, Ross,' who figures as a landowner, and who enunciates revolutionary and seditious sentiments in a strongly provincial accent, and with an impartiality of abuse which spares no rank or profession,—this view we repeat, is entirely false. That state of things where 'seven halfpenny' loaves should be sold for a penny, and the three-hooped pot 'should have ten hoops,' has been promised at various times in our history. And such promises have been liberally showered on the Eastern Counties. The Litterer's rebellion in the fourteenth century, and Kett's rebellion in the sixteenth, are instances of this; and the latter outbreak, which is well described by Mr. Froude,\* has in it some elements which strongly remind us of the events of this year. The enclosure of commons, or rather the conversion of arable land into pastures, appears to have been a chief grievance then, and now-a-days Mr. Arch seldom makes a speech without denouncing enclosures.

Again, in the memory of the present generation, there were disturbances on the introduction of the first rude machinery for thrashing and dressing corn. The writer of these lines remembers how night after night the horizon used to be lit up with a dull glare, sometimes at one point sometimes at another, by the flames of burning stack-yards; and the assize records of 1830–1832 will give but too many instances of the retribution exacted from the unhappy authors of the damage. 'Swing,' the half-mythical impersonation of the flail and its rights, is not yet forgotten, and might almost be foreshadowed by the 'drudging goblin,' of whom Milton sings, that—

' — in one night, ere glimpse of morn,  
His shadowy flail has thrashed the corn  
That ten day-labourers could not end.'

'Swingal' is the East Anglian name for that part of a flail which beats the corn,—the thong, so to speak, of the wooden whip, and is in fact the Anglo-Saxon 'swingl,' a whip. Threatening notices, left on the doorstep or pushed into the window of a farmhouse, and warning the occupant that if he persisted in using a thrashing-machine his stacks would be burnt, were usually signed 'Swing.'

In this point, however, the labourer of the present day shows himself far in advance of his fathers. In spite of much provocation, in spite of speeches which cannot be termed less than incendiary, there has been no instance of riot on the part of the labourers themselves, unless indeed one or two cases of

\* *History of England*, vol. v.

intimidation,

intimidation, with which the wives had perhaps as much to do as the husbands, can be called by that name.\* This is a matter for which we cannot be too thankful: it shows a real advance in civilisation,—an advance due, as we believe, to a conviction on the part of the working classes, and this in spite of all assertions to the contrary, that they are members of a community where law and justice exist, and that their fellow citizens, whatever Mr. Arch and Mr. Ward may say, are not disposed to allow them to be unjustly or tyrannically used by their employers, or by any one else.

Although similar movements among the country poor have taken place from time to time, there is of course no question that the present stir arose about two years since, and that the most important person in this movement is Joseph Arch. Nevertheless, long before Joseph Arch's name was known except in Primitive Methodist circles, a man who belongs to a profession which Joseph Arch and all his less scrupulous allies delight in vilifying,—the profession of an English Clergyman,—had made a proposal for the formation of a National Union of Agricultural Labourers. This was done by Canon Girdlestone at a meeting of the British Association at Norwich, as long ago as 1868; and at that time he stated, as he had in effect done long before in the columns of the 'Times,' that nothing short of combination would effect any improvement in the deplorable condition of the peasantry.

It is an unfortunate thing that the people who write neatly bound books with metaphorical titles and illustrations on a subject like this, cannot be persuaded to tell us the plain truth without edging it with prismatic colours. We have placed at the head of this article the names of three books, all of which contain a certain amount of information on the subject of this 'Labour Movement,' but none of which is free from the vice to which we have referred. Of these far the most valuable is a book by Mr. Heath, entitled 'The English Peasantry;' and although there is in it something of the tendency to which we have alluded, which, if we might coin a phrase, we should call 'Our-own-Correspondentism,'—there is much valuable information derived from trustworthy sources.

Mr. Heath devotes two chapters of his book to an account of the state of the peasantry in the *West* of England, giving copious

---

\* On each of two occasions when cases of this nature were brought before the magistrates at Bury St. Edmund's, a clergyman was on the Bench. If there are country gentlemen enough to perform the duties of Justice of the Peace, as is certainly the case in the county of Suffolk, it would surely be much better that the clergy should not interfere in matters of criminal law.

details, and details of such a nature as to make us wonder, not that strikes take place among that class, but that the class itself did not either cease to exist or at all events begin to strike years and years ago. These chapters lead naturally on to a very interesting statement of what, in the slang of the day, is called 'the work' of Canon Girdlestone. That gentleman having, as we are told, spent part of his previous life in Lancashire, had been used to see the bright side of peasant existence. He was shocked at the spectacle presented by Devonshire labourers receiving 7s. to 8s. a week, and three or four daily pints of cider of execrable quality, with very little piece work and hardly any harvest wages, with bad cottages, chance fuel, and only such milk as was not given to the pigs. He tried private remonstrance, but in vain. Then, in the midst of the cattle plague, he adopted an expedient somewhat similar to that of a Scots minister who, in respect of his enemies, took a safe revenge by praying for them: the forms of the liturgy not admitting this procedure, Canon Girdlestone boldly preached against them, and, taking for his text these words, 'Behold the hand of the Lord is upon thy cattle,' he urged upon his hearers the consideration that they had been treating their labourers worse than they would their cattle. He raised a terrible storm. The farmers persecuted him in every way, and finally insulted him in a peculiarly agricultural fashion: they came to his tithe dinner, and then refused to drink his health. Canon Girdlestone, being a brave man, pursued the one course open to every Englishman who suffers persecution: he wrote to the 'Times.' This opened the whole subject to public view. General sympathy was aroused; offers of money, of employment, of helps to migration poured in. And there can be no doubt that the discussion which arose in consequence of this proceeding on the part of Canon Girdlestone, has been among the main causes of that stir among farm-labourers which has prevailed during the last few years, as in like manner it is to him the labourers owe the first suggestion of a Labourers' Union.

The career of Joseph Arch is matter of notoriety. It cannot be asserted that the English labourer is as a rule 'addicted' to piety. And, perhaps, our clerical readers will not be inclined to agree with us if we assert that peasant piety has a great tendency to adopt some form or other of Methodism. Dissent, nay even Wesleyan Methodism itself, is not strong in the villages. Congregational nonconformity requires, naturally enough, a congregation. Numerous pews must be filled to create a stipend. There is, by the bye, little doubt that the pleasure of exclusive possession contributes largely to the attractiveness



attractiveness of the 'chapel' as it is now called, or 'meeting-house,' as was its name when nonconformity was religious, not political, and would as soon have touched pitch as made alliance with Bradlaugh; but day labourers can afford but very slender seat-rents, and often prefer the uncouth utterances of a preacher taken from their own class to the more varnished vulgarities of the ordinary 'minister.' Hence the growing power of Primitive Methodism in villages and small country towns. Liturgical forms 'bore' the peasant. Ordinary Dissent finds it does not pay to start a 'cause' where no grist comes to the ecclesiastical mill, and there is nothing left but this form or no-form of worship, its deal desk for pulpit, its rough benches for pews, and men of the class of Joseph Arch for preachers. When the dream of radical politicians is realised, the Church of England disendowed, and the land restored to its 'rightful' owners, it will be well if the four-acred farmers of those times get such recognition of divine things as these rude ministrations supply, for assuredly they will in many places get none which is better.

The first public appearance of Joseph Arch as what is called an 'agitator,' was at a meeting convened at Wellesbourne, in Warwickshire, a village where the labourers came to the conclusion that the time had come to do something for the purpose of raising wages.\* He made his speech from 'a pig-killing board' set under a tree. The police stepped in, the gas in the village lamps was turned off, but he persevered. Many subsequent speeches have been reported, but of this his maiden speech there is no record. No doubt however it was very effective, for a few weeks afterwards began the Wellesbourne strike, and in the May following, this meeting having been held in February 1872, the National Agricultural Labourers' Union was established.

The first number of the Labourers' Union Chronicle was printed 6th June 1872. Its original title was as follows: 'The Labourers' Union Chronicle and Journal of the National Agricultural Labourers' Organisation,' conducted by J. E. Matthew Vincent, Hon. Treasurer of the N. A. L. U. (National Agricultural Labourers' Union.) Within the last few weeks it has altered its title to 'The Labourers' Union Chronicle, an Independent Advocate of the British Toilers' Rights to Free Land, Freedom from Priestcraft and from the Tyranny of Capital,' and Mr. Vincent has dropped his designation of 'Hon. Treasurer of the N. A. L. U.,' although he appears still to act in that office, so

---

\* One of the slippancies of modern English is the use of the Scotch vulgarism 'wage,' in place of the good old English word 'wages.' The first form does not occur either in the Authorized Version or in Shakespeare; the second form is both singular and plural.

far, at all events, as regards contributions for the locked-out labourers. It will be at once seen that this change of title is significant, and that what was originally and ostensibly a movement for the improvement of the financial and social condition of the Agricultural Labourer, is now assuming larger dimensions, and identifying itself more and more with the general programme of the advanced Radical Party.\*

This, we think, is much to be regretted, but it is the natural tendency of all agitations to go further than their original promoters intend. And the peculiar feature of this movement is, that it is almost sure to be dependent for its voice on persons who take it up, more or less, as a means to an end, and who parade the wrongs and sufferings of the agricultural labourer in order to be able more conveniently to attack institutions, such for instance as the parochial ministry of the Church of England, and what are called the 'Land Laws,' on the plea that these are answerable for the condition of the peasantry. Abolish the Church of England to-morrow, and how will that tend to raise wages or improve cottages? Many villages would lose the presence of a respectable gentleman, whose profession puts him on something like an equality with all his neighbours, who may sometimes not be very active in that profession, nor have very clear views of doctrine, nor very great power of exposition, who may not be very keen in visiting his flock, or very judicious in the exercise of benevolence and the dispensing of charities, but who, after all, is likely to apply his time, and his income, slender though it may be, in a less selfish manner than any ordinary small country gentleman would do. Surely the influence of country clergymen is usually a humanising and civilising influence. And if they have not generally been so chivalrous as Canon Girdlestone in the defence of the rights of the poor, it cannot be said that as a body they have sided with oppression. If they have not done all the good they could, they have not done much positive harm.

There can be no doubt, however, that among the leaders of this movement, hatred to the clergy has been a very prominent motive. After all, Joseph Arch is not a labourer; he is a dis-

---

\* The following is an extract from the leading article of the first number of the regenerated 'L. U. Chronicle':—'All the toilers . . . must be our clients. Our heart is large, our purposes are great, our influence is extensive and is extending; and when all who live by toil shall give their fealty to us, our advocacy will be irresistible.'

How forcibly it reminds us of Jack Cade:—'Valiant I am . . . I am able to endure much . . . and when I am king, as king I will be, all shall eat and drink on my score; and I will apparel them in one livery, that they may agree like brothers, and worship me their lord.'—Second Part *King Henry VI.*, act iv. sc. 2.

senting minister of a rustic type, influenced by the jealousies and prejudices of his class. From the Rev. Baldwin Brown and Mr. Spurgeon, down to the humblest Primitive Methodist minister, there is an abiding sense of social inferiority to the clergy, which lies, we are persuaded, at the root of those feelings which have created, and which support, such institutions as the Society for the Abolition of State Patronage and Control of the Church, or whatever, accurately, its lumbering title may be. The Nonconformist Haman is a good Christian of a most respectable though rather vulgar type; but the glory of independence of State control, and the multitude of the congregation, and the abolition of tests, and the extinction of church-rates avail him nothing, so long as the State Church Mordecai sits at the King's gate.

But while the fact of Joseph Arch's position has helped to give to this movement an Anti-State Church character, it must not be forgotten that among the labourers many of the more thoughtful are attached by conviction to Primitive Methodism. These thoughtful labourers are naturally the most inclined to review and be dissatisfied with their position, and taking up their own cause and the cause of their fellows as religious men, they have produced in these strikes some of the characteristics of a religious conflict. And when, as has been the case in Suffolk, the locked-out men, or those who are on strike, meet together in the humble village chapel on Sunday, and hold religious services having especial reference to their struggle, that struggle is likely to be more lasting in its duration and more permanent in its effects.

The pages of that Book, full of varied lore, suited to all the needs and sorrows and joys of human life, contain passages which are strong weapons for a cause like this. 'Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.' There's a text for a sermon to lock-outs! And when they look for apostolic practice, they read that 'all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as everyone had need.'

This semi-religious character which the contest has assumed is not its least serious feature. The East Anglian labourer may not have much acuteness, but he has great solidity. Some time since, one of the largest landowners in Suffolk, after noticing what we have just noticed—the religious element in the contest—observed that no two more obstinate classes were ever pitted  
against

against each other than these farmers and these labourers ; they are in fact of the same stock—the stock who, as officers in the great Continental war used to observe, would go more doggedly to certain death than any other soldiers in the army. •

Another, and a very different cause of this agitation, is that hunger for land which seems almost, if not quite, a natural and congenital propensity in the human race. The labourer with no garden, pines for a garden. The man with a small allotment, pines for a larger one. The man with six acres wants fifteen.\* The man with a two-horse farm wants a four-horse farm ; and so on. But this *sacra fames* is made use of by the professional people of the movement to serve their own ends ; those ends being simply what plain people call confiscation.

‘The objects contemplated by the National Union of Agricultural Labourers are, as set forth by the Union :—1. “To improve the general condition of agricultural labourers in the United Kingdom.” 2. “To encourage the formation of Branch and District Unions ;” and 3. “To promote co-operation and communication between Unions already in existence.”’†

But these are not the objects of the leaders of the movement, at least not the ultimate objects, so far as land is concerned. These objects may be best stated by a quotation from Herbert Spencer’s ‘Social Statics,’ extracted with approval in a leading article of the ‘Labourers’ Chronicle’ of June 18th, 1874 :—

‘We see that the right of each man to the use of the earth, *limited only by the like rights of his fellow-men*, is immediately deducible from the law of equal freedom. We see that the maintenance of this right *necessarily forbids private property in land . . .*’

This goes rather farther than that celebrated article in the Rules of the Lincolnshire Labour League, which specifies that the rate of wages should not be less than 18s. per week. And that stirred the Suffolk farmers to frenzy !

This is not the place to discuss at length the question of the Land Laws. Suffering, however, as we do, from that stupidity

\* See a letter in the ‘Times’ of August 15, in which the writer gives a most interesting account of a ‘cottier,’ as he calls him, near Ipswich, who had managed to maintain himself on six acres of land, although with great difficulty, but who said, ‘if I only had fifteen acres, I should not care to call the Queen my cousin.’ It may be observed that the ‘Labourers’ Chronicle,’ being rather puzzled how to reply to the plain statement contained in this letter, calls the ‘cottier’ a cunning peasant, assumes that the gross produce of an ordinary farm would equal 10l. an acre, whereas three quarters of wheat per acre on the whole farm would not amount to that sum ; and puts words into the ‘cottier’s’ mouth which he is not reported to have used, viz., that he ‘grows’ a certain crop, when he only says he ‘has grown’ such a crop on some occasion or other.

† ‘The English Peasantry,’ p. 200.

and ignorance which is one of the invariable characteristics of the London Press,\* we are obliged to confess that we are unable to see why the right of each man to the use of his own hat, limited only by the like rights of his fellow-men, is not as immediately deducible from the law of equal freedom, as his right to the use of the earth; and if so, why it does not immediately follow that the maintenance of this right necessarily forbids private property in hats. If all the land is to be cut up into four-acre patches, and everybody is to use, that is, we suppose, dig up and plant any four-acre patch, according to the law of equal freedom, we can hardly expect much of a crop. Putting that aside, however, why does not the law of equal freedom apply just as much to railway shares as to land? In which case everybody will appropriate everybody else's dividend, subject, of course, to that highly-intelligible proviso, that his right to the use thereof must be limited by the rights of his fellow-men.†

But granting as much as any landowner could desire as to the rights of that order, and having no wish to fall in with theories which can never be carried into practice except after a bloody and disastrous civil war, rendering almost valueless the subject of the quarrel, we are still constrained to acknowledge that much hardship has been inflicted on the poor in previous generations by the enclosures which took place before the passing of the present General Act on that subject. Arthur Young was no radical leveller. He was heir of land which had belonged to his forefathers for two centuries. He was Secretary of the Board of Agriculture in the reign of George III. But what does he say about enclosures? 'The fact is, that by nineteen enclosure Bills out of twenty the poor are injured—in some, grossly injured.'‡ And he puts into the mouth of a poor man words which might have appeared in the 'Labourers' Chronicle':—

'Go to an alehouse kitchen of an old enclosed country, and there you will see the origin of poverty and poor rates. For whom are they to be sober? For whom are they to save? (such are their questions). For the parish? If I am diligent, shall I have leave to

---

\* Heading of leading article 'Labourers' Union Chronicle' of July 4, 1874, 'The Stupidity and Ignorance of the London Press.'

† Sir George Campbell, at the late meeting of the British Association, read a paper on 'The Privileges of Land, wrongly called Property;' meaning, of course, to point out by this verbal paradox that property has its duties as well as its rights, and that a man has *not* (pace a late Duke of Newcastle) a right to do what he likes with his own. What we mean by property is, a personal appropriation of the duties attaching to income, whether derived from land or from any other source, but we do not deny that those duties exist. The Christian notion of property is stewardship.

‡ 'Inquiry into the Propriety of applying Wastes to the better Maintenance and Support of the Poor.' Bury St. Edmunds, 1801. P. 42.

build a cottage? If I am sober, shall I have land for a cow? If I am frugal, shall I have half an acre for potatoes? You offer no motives; you have nothing but a parish officer and a workhouse. *Bring me another pot.*

Going then into calculations as to the comparative cost of keeping families in the workhouse on the one hand, and giving them money to settle on common land on the other, he declares himself much in favour of the latter alternative. It must, however, be observed that he makes a stipulation that *the land should be inalienable*. 'This is hardly consistent with the modern complaint of the difficulty and expense which attaches to the transfer of land—a difficulty ascribed to the greed of the aristocracy.'

Among the injurious results of enclosures he specifies one, that the poor were thence compelled to *sell their cows*. Now if, instead of stimulating the bad passions of ignorant men, the spokesmen of this labour movement would take up some practical question like the supply of milk to labourers, they would do incalculable good. No one who has seen a milk-fed peasantry can have any doubt that the want of milk in all 'enclosed countries' (to use Arthur Young's words) is a most serious evil. It is almost too soon to speculate what effect this want may have upon the physical strength of the race; but no one can deny that the Irish and Scotch, who are fed on milk, with perhaps nothing else except oatmeal, are a far finer race than the farm labourers of the Eastern Counties, who, as children, hardly ever taste milk.

But we must proceed with our subject. During the last two or three years, under the influence of various causes, there has been a gradual 'hardening' of the price of labour, so to speak, in Norfolk and Suffolk, as in other parts of the country. It showed itself more distinctly at harvest than at any other time, and harvest wages sprung up from 6*l.* or 7*l.* to 8*l.*, 9*l.*, and even 11*l.* But the first clear evidence of the action of the Labourers' Union appears to have been given by a letter, reprinted in the 'Times' some weeks since, which, as a specimen of the mode of procedure adopted by that body, we here produce:—

'DEAR SIR,

'Alderton, February 22, 1874.

'The Agricultural Labourers of this Branch of the National Agricultural Union in your employ beg respectfully to inform you that on and after 2 March 1874 they will require A rise in their wages of One Shilling per week A weeks work to Consist of fifty hours being desirous of retaining good relations between employer and employed and to assure you that no unbecoming feelings prompt us to such A course we invite you if our terms are not in accordance

with your view to appoint an earley time to meet us so that we may fairley Consider the mater and arrange our affairs amicably.

‘Yours obedient servants,  
‘The Committee.’

Alderton is a parish near the sea, in the extreme S.E. of Suffolk, and partly belonging to Lord Rendlesham; and this letter, or a similar one, was served on twelve farmers in that district, the Wilford Hundred. It appears to have been sent in accordance with the ordinary rules of Agricultural Unions. We extract from the rules of the Lincolnshire Union:—

#### ‘DISPUTES BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED.

‘1. Members of this League wishing to obtain any material alteration in the conditions of their employment, must, before acquainting their employers of their intention to obtain such alteration, lay their case before the Committee of the Branch to which they belong, who, in turn, must at once give information to the Council through the General Secretary; and the Branch Committee and Executive Council, in conjunction, shall immediately take such action thereon as may be necessary: but in no case will members of the League receive assistance from its funds should they voluntarily cease to work without the sanction of their Branch Committee and the Executive Council.

‘3. When members have obtained the sanction of their Branch Committee and the Council to ask their employers for an alteration in the conditions of their employment, the request must be made in a civil and conciliatory manner; no threat or angry words must be used. And should the employers decline to grant their requests, the Branch Committee shall use every endeavour by deputation and offers of arbitration to settle the differences in an amicable manner; at the same time keeping the Council well informed, and acting on any advice the Council may give.’

There is nothing in the wording of this letter which suggests a reason why it should not have been noticed by those to whom it was addressed. It is quiet and respectful, and is addressed to members of a class not very perceptibly different in rank from that of the writer. In many cases the children of the labourer are better taught than the children of the farmer; the habits of the two classes are much the same, the chief difference being that the one does the hard work and the other the easy work of the farm which they both unite in cultivating and tending. At the same time it must be remembered that the persons to whom it was addressed belong to a class which is not distinguished for consideration of the feelings of others, which is easily irritated, and which, at the particular juncture when this letter was written, had had much to irritate it. It is only lately that the farmers have been awakened to the fact that labourers

labourers have ceased to be children. It is, however, so, and this fact has to be met. It happens in many households that the first assertion of independence on the part of the eldest son is a sore trial—a cause of heartburnings and coldness; he is no longer a child, but the parents are unable to realize the new relations which must henceforth exist between them and him. So with the farm labourer. For generations past his wages and his position have been pretty much what his employer chose. Without being legally tied to the soil, he was virtually so. Having legal freedom of contract, he had no actual freedom of contract. This is so no longer, and never can be so again. And this was the fact which the farmers, first of East and then of West Suffolk, have had to face. In East Suffolk they refused to recognize it; they sent no reply to the letter of ‘the Committee,’ and the consequence was a strike. In West Suffolk they anticipated action on the part of any ‘Committee’ by a lock-out.

There is a great distinction between the two cases, but we cannot acquit the farmers of all blame in either. In the first case, however, we think their error not much more than an error of judgment. Although the letter of the labourers was most properly worded, we must remark that the persons to whom it was addressed had been loaded with abuse by the orators of the Unions and by the newspaper which is or was the organ of all the Unions in the country. And thus being very partially able to defend themselves, having never been used to much notice of any kind, particularly of an unfavourable nature, when they awoke to the fact that they were being most freely criticised, that speeches were being made which they had not eloquence to reply to, and articles written which they had no literary ability to answer, and even songs made upon them—a grievance which has been felt to be such ever since the time of the Psalmist—which they could not repel by any counterblast of poetry, they simply did what their cart-horses are sometimes inclined to do when over-weighted: they turned what they would call ‘rusty,’ and did nothing. This, we think, was an error in judgment, but it is an error which persons suddenly introduced into new circumstances are very apt to commit. For a labourer to speak was a portent like that which occurred to a certain prophet in Old Testament story, and the impulse of the other interlocutor was ‘probably much like Balaam’s: ‘I would there were a sword in my hand, for now would I kill thee!’ The farmers, however, did not go so far as manslaughter—they only did not raise their labourers’ wages. Upon this the men struck; the strike extended to other parts of the country, and things looked serious, particularly as about that time a similar state of things existed in Cambridgeshire,



Lincolnshire, and elsewhere. From this time, for about two or three months, a game of brag was played between master and men; unfortunately, however, for the men, the spring was unusually dry, the usual amount of weeding and other spring labour was not required, and the weather fought against the Labourers' Union. Had the spring been wet, matters would not have been so pleasant for the masters; the result might practically have been 'the' same, but attended, for them, with far greater inconvenience.

In West Suffolk the farmers, or at least a large proportion of them, played a different game. Headed by an eminent Parliamentary barrister, who is himself a considerable farmer, and backed by some local land-surveyors and lawyers, they formed a Defence Association, and locked out all men who belonged to the Union, passing a resolution at a public meeting, which in effect, though not in words, was directed against all Unions whatever. This meeting was held in the first days of June, and from that time until harvest a contest was carried on, the results of which cannot be very clearly traced, but which appears to have ended, so far as the farmers are concerned, by their having stuck to the text of not employing Union men, and, so far as the labourers are concerned, by some of them having lost their harvest work, some having emigrated, and some having silently or otherwise dropped their connection with the Union.

But when we come to the statistics of the subject, it will be seen that the struggle has not yet assumed such dimensions as to render it at all probable that the present state of things is final. So far as is known, the farmers have had the best of it; they have done with less work before harvest, they have had no difficulty in the harvest itself, in many cases the Union men have not succeeded in getting employment, and in some cases they have become chargeable upon the parishes as paupers. But what are the numbers of the combatants, compared to the total numbers of each class in the county of Suffolk? Out of 38,000 labourers, not more than one-fifth are members of any Union. Out of 4600 farmers and graziers, little more than one-eighth have joined any Defence Association. It is also asserted that half the Union labourers were at work all through the heat of the struggle, so that the contest, so far as it has gone, has been a contest in which one-eighth of the farmers have vanquished one-tenth of the labourers. Who can say that this is a decisive victory?

And such as it is, there is some reason to suppose that the victory has been achieved by an instrument of doubtful legality. There was a trial at Manchester during the Summer  
Assizes

Assizes of this year, which, if the decision of Mr. Baron Pollock was good law, seems to show that a combination of persons for objects like that of the Farmers' Defence Association is of an illegal character. The case was this:—"Certain members of the Manchester Self-acting Minds' Association refused to work with a man who was not a member of this association—the result being that this man lost his work. Baron Pollock, as reported in the '*Pall Mall Gazette*' of August 6, said, 'It was perfectly lawful for one man to say he would not ride in a particular omnibus, or buy bread from a particular baker; but if a body of men agreed together not to ride in that omnibus, or not to buy bread from that baker, it would be an improper interference with a man's earning his livelihood.' One farmer may refuse to employ a man who belongs to a Union, but if 200 farmers unite in pledging themselves not to employ him, surely it is 'an improper interference with that man's earning his livelihood.' We commend this to the careful consideration of the able lawyer who presides over the destinies of the West Suffolk Farmers' Defence Association.

What are the practical lessons to be drawn from the struggle which we have reviewed, for landlords, farmers, and labourers? May we urge upon landowners the consideration that we live in times in which the title to all property is jealously scrutinised, and in which the duties which by general consent attach to property, especially to visible and tangible property, multiply daily? There are parishes from which the grandfathers of the present owners swept away every cottage, to prevent the possibility of any labourer who worked on the land and created the rental, being a burden on that rental for time to come. Happily at present there is no temptation to repeat this practice in other parishes, the law of settlement having been altered. But society is rapidly coming to the conclusion that one of the duties, either of the owners of land as owners or of the State coming to their aid and making up for the deficiencies and malfeasance of past generations, is to provide dwellings, not hovels, not pigsties, as Lord Shaftesbury called them, but proper dwellings for the labourer who tills the land, at a reasonable distance from the land which he tills. A man who has to walk two or three miles to and from his work is most unfairly handicapped against one who steps from his cottage into the field where he has to spend his strength. Moreover he loses his chance of working at an allotment or cultivating his garden, if he have one.

Where cottages exist, it is very commonly the practice to let them to the tenant of the land around. We very much doubt the

the propriety of this practice. It puts the labourer too much at the mercy of his employer, and also encourages short tenancies. Nothing tends so much to settle a labourer and to render him satisfied with and attached to his position as security of tenure, particularly if that tenure extend to a garden as well as a cottage, and if that garden be a quarter of an acre in extent, so much the better. We believe it will be found that most labourers would be better off with regular and fair wages, together with a cottage and large garden, than if put into possession of that four-acre farm of which Mr. Arch and Mr. Taylor draw such golden pictures.

If the farmers will condescend to hear a word of advice, we should make bold to remind them that, although at present they seem to have had the best of the contest, it has been but a preliminary skirmish, and that unless the labourer is placed in a condition more satisfactory, both as to wages and as to the general condition of hiring, than has been the case up to this time, they may depend upon it that these battles will recur with renewed intensity and increased bitterness. Never again, in the face of Labourers' Union Chronicles and a propaganda of discontent, can farmers hope to retain the labourer in the former subjection. They must be prepared to have to deal with him, if not more as a free agent, certainly as one much more under foreign influences than heretofore. In self-defence, the farmers will do well if they do what they can to attach the labourer to the land. For weekly notice and weekly hiring, three months, or still longer terms, should be substituted, with particular stipulations as to harvest. We have before referred to the milk question: it is only to be regretted that some power does not exist, just as a water supply is compulsory in towns, to make a milk supply, for labourers' children, compulsory in the country.

It may be well to remind the tenant-farmer that he is, after all, the least necessary element in the agricultural hierarchy. Owners of the land there must be, either public or private, under the present or under any future state of 'land laws.' Cultivators of the soil there must also be so long as agriculture goes on; but the tenant-farmer, the middleman, is an accident of English country life, which has no analogy in many other countries, and which, under other circumstances, may very possibly cease to exist even here. The tenant-farmer then will do well to remember that, although his house stands strong as things now are, obstinate resistance to the fair demands of his labourers may stimulate emigration, may introduce the practice of co-operative farming, and, if and when the county franchise is extended to the

the labourers, may again make the counties the strongholds of extreme opinions, just as they were in the days of an un-reformed Parliament.

It cannot be too strongly urged on the labourer, that, of all luxuries and necessities, fresh air is the greatest, and that the want of fresh air is but poorly made up by larger wages. This is not the place to enlarge on the charms of the country, nor are we about to urge the virtues of contentment and ten shillings a week. The Catechism, which many poor children learn, has been misrepresented as inculcating the duty of being content with that state of life into which it has pleased God to call us. It does nothing of the kind, it simply says that we should do our duty in that state of life into which it *shall please* God to call us; not that we are to be content with ten shillings, but that we are not to misapply twenty.

But while the labourer is fully justified in taking all lawful and orderly means of improving his position, he ought to bear in mind that, after all, there are great advantages in a state of life in which we know our neighbours, in which we 'dwell among our own people,' in which the relations of employer and employed, landlord and tenant, have a permanent rather than a temporary character. In towns, all men are more or less Arabs, here to-day and gone to-morrow, according to the laws which regulate the demand and the supply of labour. In the country, there is less excitement, less competition, a lower scale of pay; but, for all except the most pushing, the country affords attractions for the steady and industrious labourer which are never to be found in the roar of the streets and the bustle of the factory.

There is a good deal of coxcombry talked about the order of the peasantry; the distinctive smock-frock has had many mourners; but we may depend upon it, this is an order to which its members are attached not of their own free will but by compulsion alone. In a new sense we may say,

*'Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?'*

It is the order of the peasantry which has colonised Canada, which is pouring year by year into the illimitable plains and woods of the West, constantly setting back the boundary of the desert and turning uncultivated wastes into verdure and fertility, and which in one generation has raised Australia to the dignity of a fifth quarter of the globe. This is not an instrument to be thoughtlessly misused or carelessly thrown away. It is their bone and sinew, nay their shrewdness and skill, which is constantly recruiting the ranks of the upper classes, which makes England what she is, and which in the next half-century

ture will make the English tongue the ruling language of the world.

Good done to this class spreads through all the ranks of society; and if those who possess influence with this class would use their influence, as some men have used it, not in pandering to its prejudices or influencing its passions, but in developing its best instincts, consulting its real welfare and increasing its self-respect, they would deserve far more than most men the honourable title of benefactors of mankind.

---

ART. VIII.—*Worthies of All Souls; Four Centuries of English History illustrated from the College Archives.* By Montagu Burrows, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of All Souls. London, 1874.

THE history of a college or of any corporation which has enjoyed an independent existence for more than four centuries possesses a special value as reflecting the continuous development and change going on in the world around. A college is a microcosm of the university, the university of the nation.

‘Chronica si penses, cum pugnant Oxonienses,  
Post paucos menses volat ira per Angligenenses.’

Mr. Burrows in the work before us endeavours to represent the history of All Souls as a microcosm of the history of the nation. The interdependence of national and university history he has already illustrated in an interesting lecture on the ‘National character of the old English Universities,’ published in his former volume of ‘Constitutional Progress.’\* The connection between the smaller corporation of the college and that of the nation is one degree more remote; and when an alternative title is given to the work before us of ‘Four Centuries of English History illustrated from the College Archives,’ we must warn the historical student against expecting much. The ‘illustrations’ appear to us more suitable to the lecture-room than the library. For ourselves we should have liked more of ‘All Souls’ and less of ‘English History.’

All Souls College was founded in the middle of the fifteenth century; the Papal bull of institution is dated 1439. The college therefore belongs to a special class of university foundations. New College, All Souls, and Magdalen, institutions

---

\* ‘Constitutional Progress,’ 2nd edition. London. 1872.

which commemorate the magnificence of Wykeham, Chichele, and Waynflete, mark the transition between mediæval and modern Oxford. Merton and its compeers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, had fought the battle of the college system within the university. New College, All Souls, and their successors entered into the fruits of the victory. That victory was more easily and more completely won in the English universities than elsewhere in Europe. The system of organisation by 'nations' was in essence an attempt to ameliorate the evils of division and dissension by giving legal constitution and discipline to the contending parties. At Oxford it never found much favour. As early as 1313 the division of the students into Northerners and Southerners (*Boreales* and *Australes*) was denounced as not lessening but aggravating dissension.\* Peace and tranquillity could only be really secured by exercising an effective control over the domestic life of the students. Hence from the voluntary unions of the hostels for common life and mutual protection arose the official hostels or halls presided over by a university officer. These, too, eventually had to give way before the stronger organisation of the endowed colleges; and it was at the beginning of the fifteenth century that the exclusive superiority of the colleges within the university began to be acknowledged.

The century which elapsed between the period of the foundation of All Souls and the Reformation, is not a distinguished one in University annals. It was the century of the Wars of the Roses and of early Tudor oppression; but it was the century also of the Renaissance, when the 'new learning' first became known in England. Mr. Burrows, we think, shows singular want of grasp in his conception of what the Renaissance was. He looks upon it merely as the revival of the study of Greek in Western Europe, and fails to recognise the multifarious character of the movement, and the multifarious accomplishments of its prophets, of whom Linacre—of All Souls—was one of the greatest. He does not observe that the Renaissance is really a period or an epoch—a cluster of events and of discoveries—an *Aufklärung* or *Illumination*—a marked step onwards in the advance of the human intellect. Whilst in Italy the Universities adopted the 'new learning' with enthusiasm, and suffered only because of the establishment of the rival 'academies,' and the restless desire that men had of hearing what *all* teachers had to say or of teaching at *every* University,† north of the Alps a real struggle was engaged in. In Germany the obscurantists, the maintainers of scholasti-

\* 'Munimenta Academica Oxon.,' vol. i. p. 92.

† Facciolati, 'Syntagmata Gymnasii Patavini,' cap. vii.

cism, were in a great majority, and at one time the Theological Faculty of Cologne had actually obtained leave from the Emperor to collect and burn all Hebrew books. The *auto da fe* was fortunately prevented from taking place. The eventual triumph of the cause of enlightenment was there due, to a great extent, to the satire of the 'Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum'; in France and England it was only brought about by the interference of the Crown in the foundation of the Regius Professorships at Paris and Oxford. In what relation did the new collegiate foundations, such as All Souls, stand to this movement, and how comes it that these, the most magnificent of Oxford colleges, are contemporary in their early years with that general decline of the University, noted by Wood\* and other writers? These are problems which Mr. Burrows does not deal with, probably because he has no help to give us for their solution. In one passage he is somewhat tantalising when he says—

'Among the earliest entries on the college books occur notices of permission of absence, given to different fellows for stated periods, in order that they may pursue their studies at foreign universities.'—Page 47.

and then gives no names. The lines from the 'Ship of Fools' on the subject are well known:—

'One runneth to Almayne, another into Fraunce,  
To Paris, Padway, Lombardy, or Spaine :  
Another to Bonony, Rome, or Orleauunce,  
To Cayns, to Tholous, Athens, or Colayne,  
And at last returneth home agayne  
More ignoraunt.'

We should like to have been able to test the experience of All Souls as to the results of these dispensations. We regret that Mr. Burrows has not given us a Register of the Fellows, as well as a list of the Wardens, and a Calendar, even though an imperfect one, of the documents in the archives relating to public men and public affairs. The volume is already bulky, but we think we could find room for two such appendices. Of the book as it is, the most interesting parts are the history of the relation of the college to the Crown, the history of the disposition of the surplus, and of the tenure and succession to Fellowships, and the connection (still honourably maintained) of All Souls with the study of law. These subjects we shall touch upon successively, gathering together the materials provided for us by Mr. Burrows.

All Souls, like the other colleges of the University, passed

---

\* E.g., sub annis 1438, 1455, 1460, 1466, 1500, &c.

safely through the crisis of the Reformation. Henry VIII., as is well known, kept the University for a long time in suspense; and it and its constituent bodies were eventually spared much more by submission in the matter of the divorce, and by acknowledging the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, than by the 'highly-cultivated minds' of the Tudor princes and their enlightened conceptions of what a 'Tudor Reformation' was to be. All Souls, however, long before Tudor times, had had a narrow escape from royal rapacity. Chichele, with a view, as he thought, more effectually to secure his new institution, associated King Henry VI. as co-founder with himself. Both Edward IV. and Henry VII. were fain to consider that the property of a royal foundation became royal property. This danger was escaped, we know not how. But although foiled in its designs of entire confiscation, the Crown attempted to obtain the right of regulating the disposition of collegiate property. For instance, the University and colleges, as ecclesiastical foundations, had always been taxed by convocation, and, like the clergy, were free from extraordinary war taxes. Nevertheless, applications for loans and benevolences were made to them, as to all rich proprietors. A good example of such an application of the reign of Henry VII. is given by Mr. Burrows. The conclusion is very characteristic, and worth quoting:—

'This is a thing of so grete waight and importance as may not be failed. And therefore faile ye not for your said part eft soone we pray you, as ye tendre the good and honour of this our realm, and as ye tendre also the wole and suretie of yourself.'—P. 36.

Nevertheless, the college was bold enough to refuse, and strong or weak enough to refuse successfully.

College property, however, could also be made use of by the powerful to reward followers and partisans. Edward VI. required the college to grant a twenty-one years' lease of one of their farms to 'Dr. Mendye, our physician, for such rents as ye have granted the same in times past' (p. 66). The college refused humbly but persistently. Later on it was even successful in recovering property which had been kept by Elizabeth for thirty years (pp. 96, 97).

Resistance to royal encroachments was thus more successful than perhaps could have been anticipated, though doubtless victories have been much more carefully recorded than defeats. It was less easy to withstand the recommendations made by the powerful of friends and adherents for election to Fellowships, or for presentation to college livings. Such recommendations were made by almost every sovereign from Elizabeth to the Revolution,



tion, by several Archbishops of Canterbury, by princes of the blood, and by powerful nobles. Sometimes the college had to submit, but seldom, if ever, without protest. It, of course, by no means followed that those intruded were men of inferior mark or talent. On the contrary, All Souls owes Jeremy Taylor to archiepiscopal, Sydenham to Parliamentary, intrusion. For the sake of illustration we will notice the earliest and latest instances mentioned by Mr. Burrows: the first a mild recommendation, which does not appear to have been complied with; the last a mandate, which had to be obeyed.

The former is a letter, headed 'by the Prince' whom Mr. Burrows identifies conjecturally with Prince Arthur, Henry VII.'s eldest son. It runs as follows:—

'Trusty and right well beloved we grete you wel. And forasmucho as we ben credibly informed that your late election is past and nowe of late devolved into the hands of the most reverend fadre in God o' right trusty and most entirely beloved cousin y<sup>e</sup> Cardinal of Cantorbury, we desire and right affectionately pray you that the rather for o' sake and at the contemplation of these o' letters, ye wol have our right and well beloved William Pickering, scoler of lawe, inasmoche as he is of alliaunce unto the founder of y<sup>r</sup> place, and that his fadre also is in y<sup>e</sup> right tender favour of our derrest modre the quene, especially named in y<sup>e</sup> next election, as we especially trust you, whereynne be ye ascertyned us to be unto you and y<sup>r</sup> said place the more good and gracieux lord in any y<sup>r</sup> reasonable desires hereafter.'—P. 38.

With the mild request of 'the Prince,' let us contrast the style of James II. :—

'Trusty and well beloved we greet you well. Whereas we are well satisfied of the loyalty and learning of our trusty and well beloved Leopold William Finch Esquire Master of Arts and one of that our college of All Souls; we have thought fit hereby to recommend him to you in the most effectual manner for the place of Warden of our said College, now vacant by the death of Doctor Jeames late Warden thereof: Willing and requiring you forthwith to elect and admit him the said Leopold William Finch into the place of Warden aforesaid with all and singular the rights privileges and emoluments profits and advantages thereunto belonging, any statute customs or constitution of our said College to the contrary notwithstanding, with all which we are graciously pleased to dispense in his behalf: And so not doubting of your ready compliance herein we bid you farewell.

'Given at our Court at Whitehall 15th January 1686(-7) in the second year of our reign.

By his Majesty's command

SUNDEBLAND.'

(Gutch's '*Collectanea Curiosa*,' vol. ii. p. 282.)

William

William Pickering is not to be found on the list of Fellows; Finch was Warden for sixteen years. Fortunately as this was the most violent, so it was the last attempt at forced intrusion. Nay, the intruded Warden, twelve years afterwards, had to submit to a formal re-election; and in a curious letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (also printed by Gutch, vol. ii. p. 49), he apologises for making use of the mandate, on the grounds that his so doing was the only means of keeping a Papist out of the place. We would call attention to the character and career of Finch as typical of a certain class (not the very worst perhaps) of University men at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

The history of the disposition of the surplus can best be considered in relation to the general history of the Fellowships. The Fellow, according to the 'pious founder's' conception, was a student in one of the higher faculties whom the college endowments maintained during his residence at the University, and whilst engaged in these studies. Those who were maintained by the endowment became also its administrators, and the endowment being generally in the form of landed property, was susceptible of increase and decrease in value. It was not long before there was such a surplus at All Souls—surplus, that is to say, over the sum actually necessary for the maintenance of the forty original members of the foundation. This surplus was first applied to the improvement of college property, and after the Reformation to the purchase of livings, which became a species of retirement for the Fellows. An important statute was passed in the eighteenth year of Elizabeth's reign, which decreed that a certain portion of the revenue should be always set apart for the 'relief of commons and diet.' From the 'relief' to the 'augmentation' of commons was but a step, and that step was taken at All Souls by Archbishop Bancroft. The augmentation was to be 'reasonable;' but the judges of what was 'reasonable' were those who were to profit by the result. Abbot, Bancroft's successor, attempted to stem the tide, and when 'for this time' he allows 'a double livery,' he adds:—

'I should be glad to hear that when such money cometh extraordinarily unto you, it be employed in buying of books and furnishing of your studies, and not spent upon vanities which carry nothing with them but distemper and disorder.'—P. 112.

Laud, after providing that a fixed reserve should always be put into the Treasury, definitely allowed what remained to be divided. The consent of the Visitor was still necessary for the actual division, but it was never refused; and from the middle of the seventeenth

seventeenth century the college possessed complete control over the disposition of its revenues.

Long before the surplus had become anything tangible, before Fellows were in receipt of a definite income, Fellowships had become marketable commodities of a certain monetary value. The best-executed and the most valuable part of Mr. Burrows' book is that which relates the final struggle between Sancroft and the College, resulting in the 'abolition of purchase in Fellowships.' As early as the visitation of Cranmer in 1541, the practice of receiving money for the resignation of Fellowships was denounced. Parker followed Cranmer's example. Whitgift imposed an oath upon the Fellows; Abbot a more stringent one, namely, that 'all electors should take a corporal oath to make the elections and nominations freely without any reward, gift, or thing given or taken for the same.' No oath, however, was sufficiently stringent to bind a college of lawyers. As soon as liberty of election was restored to the college by the Parliament, the abuse reappeared. It was not peculiar to All Souls, but that college and New College appear to have been the most persistent offenders, and its eventual suppression at All Souls was the signal for its suppression elsewhere in the University, although as late as the middle of last century (1759) it is still spoken of as an existing abuse. The best idea of what this corrupt custom was will be obtained from the Report of the Visitors in 1657:—

'The Colledg of Alsoules in Oxon hath for a long season to the dishonour of the University suffered under a common reputation of corruption in the buying and selling of fellowships. Besides the notoriety of sundry particular instances, the constant custome and practice of resignations so ordered that ordinarily none so much as standeth for a fellowship (unlesse there happen to be a dead place\*) who hath not the benefit of a resignation from some that leave the society, and the perpetual choice of them who have such resignations doth confirme that reputation, the resignation being not made before the evening next before the election, whereby none know what places may be voyd. The major part of the fellows having an interest in keeping up this corruption agreeing together still to chuse him or them who have obtained resignations, expecting the same compliance from others when they come by any means to leave the Colledg, it is not possible for the Warden and the rest of the fellows that desire reformation to prevent this corrupt practice; things being carried amongst them by a plurality of suffrages . . . . To prevent this abuse, Orders and Injunctions have been made by the Visitors, with the prescription of oaths to that purpose, which yet have had no other effect (because of the several means of bargaining invented to evade them) than as we fear to add perjury to the other abuse and corrup-

---

\* A vacancy caused by the death of the occupant.

tions. Not long after the election in the year 1656 it pleased God to load and trouble the conscience of one Mr. Egerton who was then chosen into the Colledg: among other things this added to his perplexity that according to the custom he had given 150*l.* for the resignation whereby he obtained his fellowship. The Lord pursuing his work of grace upon his heart, he makes acknowledgement of that corruption, and resigns his fellowship unto the Colledg, as that which he could not hold upon that foundation after he had borne an open testimony against that wicked practice, and other abuses against some of the fellows of that society. Notwithstanding this testimony from heaven against that corrupt practice and bringing to light by the hand of God, the fellows this year proceed to a new election in the same way as formerly; and in all probability with the same corruption. And whereas the Warden with some of the godly and honest fellows agreed that they would chuse Mr. Egerton now again that he might come in on a clear accompte, seeing he was like to be an eminently useful member of that society, not only the major part did refuse him, but also the Sub-warden of the Colledg made a speech publicly at the election against him, desiring the Warden to take some course to proceed against him to convict him as one that had brought a scandall upon the Colledg. . . .—Pages 210, 211.

The interest of the details and the similarity of the custom to that recently abolished in the army will excuse the length of the extract. Cromwell supported his Commissioners in their attempt to repress this abuse, and his death prevented the reform from being carried out successfully.

Twenty years later the crisis arrived, and the victory was due to the persistence of Archbishop Sancroft and Warden Jeames. For the details of the struggle we must commend the reader to Mr. Burrows' own account. We can only mark the facts and the result. An election, which the Warden knew to be due to corrupt connivance with the candidates, he vetoed. Consequently, by the statutes, the right of election devolved upon the Visitor. Sancroft (the Archbishops of Canterbury are *ex-officio* Visitors of All Souls) appointed four individuals other than those selected by the Fellows:—

'To countenance the Probationers' (i.e. the new Fellows), writes the Warden, 'at their first entrance into commons, I dined in the hall myself yesterday and shall again to day, and have reduced the Fellows to their ordinary commons in messes and chopp<sup>s</sup>, whereas I have for some years allowed them to be served up in whole joints, but because they abused this liberty into excess, and brought a great charge upon the poorer Fellows, I now thought fit to retrrench it. After dinner when I was returned to my lodgings, the two Bursars and the two Deans came, with the Library Statute Book in their hand, and admonished me (in obedience to an injunction of Archbishop Whitgift) to expel the head cook, who that day chopped out  
their

their commons, and the groom of the stable for being married men, that and their relation to me (one having been my servant and the other having married my wife's maid) being the only crimes they could lay to their charge.—P. 275.

He may well add, 'We are now in a perfect state of war.' Eventually the whole question was brought by the Fellows before the Court of the King's Bench, and decided against them. The victory, once gained, was final, and the result was hailed with general satisfaction within the University.

All Souls, as is well known to Oxford men, possesses this peculiarity, that, so far as direct provision is concerned, it is a wholly non-resident, non-clerical, and non-educational college. How did this anomaly arise?

As regards the last feature in its character, there is little to be said. In the century between 1550 and 1650, it appears that servitors (servientes) are to be found on the roll, and in 1612 their number amounted to thirty-one. At the time of the Civil War they disappeared, and did not afterwards return. With this trifling exception All Souls has never admitted within its walls members not on the foundation.

The growth of the lay element is connected with that of non-residence, and both with the weight and influence which lawyers and the study of law have always possessed in the College. Of the original forty Fellows, it was provided by the Founder that sixteen were to be jurists, and all 'clericales.' Dispensation from taking orders was obtained comparatively early for the jurists. They were merely obliged to show that they had definitely, within two years, taken up the practice of Civil Law. As regards the remaining twenty-four, the obligation continued to be enforced, unless special dispensation was obtained. A connection, at first, perhaps, accidental, with the study of medicine, brought it about that a certain number of fellowships, eventually four, were reckoned as 'physic places,' and for their holders dispensation could almost invariably be obtained. The ordinary plea, however, for exemption was the service of the Crown, at first a reality, afterwards a form; and until the changes of the Commission of 1852, all lay fellows held some commission in Her Majesty's service. Since that time obligation to take orders has been entirely removed, and what is still rare in Oxford, laymen are equally eligible with clergymen to the headship of the College.

We have already noticed the fact that, during the first century of its existence, the College was in the habit of granting leave to its members to continue their studies at foreign universities. Cranmer, at his visitation in 1549, decreed that non-residence  
for

for more than six months, except through illness, or on the King's service, should entail forfeiture of a fellowship; and throughout the sixteenth century, the College jealously watched all such dispensations. When, in 1581, the Earl of Leicester sought such leave for a friend or dependant, it was specially provided that during absence the Fellow in question should derive no emoluments from the College. The growth of the Common Law induced the Jurist Fellows to prefer its study and practice in London to that of the Civil Law in Oxford. As early as 1582 Archbishop Grindal, as Visitor, refused to sanction such dispensations given by the College to its members. Whitgift attempted a compromise, but in vain. Bancroft suspended Whitgift's injunctions. It was not until after the Revolution that the whole matter was definitely settled. In the year 1702, Gardiner became Warden, and he determined to make a bold stand against what he considered the abuses of non-residence, and of dispensation from holy orders. The state of the two questions at his accession was this:—

‘The change of the All Souls Jurists from Oxford Civil and Canon Lawyers to London Common Lawyers’ was complete. ‘Their freedom from the obligation to take orders had become by long custom legitimate (though even this Gardiner disputed), and the system of dispensations which had crept in everywhere before the Revolution, under the example of the Stuart sovereigns, enabled them to pursue their profession tolerably undisturbed. Physicians, members of Parliament, public servants, such as commissioners of various kinds, were numerous both among the artists and jurists. All wanted to retain their fellowships while they performed their respective functions as non-residents; each dispensation diminished the number of clergymen, and strengthened the growing dislike to take holy orders.’—P. 353.

In the contest which ensued, which Mr. Burrows gives in detail, the Warden was defeated, and the question of non-residence was considered thenceforth as settled. The Fellows were unwilling, the Warden was unable, to revive it; for when defeated he was disarmed, and the right of veto, which had been his weapon of war, was taken away from him.

The legal reputation of the College by no means suffered from the victory of the Fellows. It was within the half of All Souls, as is well known, that Blackstone delivered his Commentaries, and Blackstone was but a distinguished successor of many Fellows who had not unworthily preceded him in the same line. We have already noticed the preponderance given to Law in the original foundation. Cranmer, in his enlightened proposal for systematising study within the University, by setting apart cer-

tain colleges to certain subjects, destined All Souls to be a purely Civil Law College. Its artists were to be transferred to New College, and the jurists of New College brought over to All Souls.' The scheme was not carried out. We do not sympathise with Mr. Burrows in rejoicing over its failure, and his joy clothes itself in somewhat incoherent language (p. 73). Nevertheless in principle Cranmer's design has been revived in modern times. In accordance with the directions of the University Commissioners, Fellowships at All Souls, for the last sixteen years, have been awarded on examination in Law and Modern History only; and the study of these two subjects it is the special duty of the College to foster within the University. Thus two professorships in these subjects have been founded—one of International Law and Diplomacy, the other of Modern History, held by Mr. Burrows; and the College has further established and, with no niggard hand, maintained a special Law Library, probably the most complete outside the metropolis, open not only to members of the University but to barristers and all students of the law. It has too modestly in this respect hidden its light under a bushel, but we trust that when the public spirit which it has shown becomes better known and better appreciated, it will find other imitators in other fields within the University.

There are many other interesting features connected with the College and its history which, if space permitted, we should like to call attention to. There is the Chapel, in its architecture midway between those of New College and Magdalen, showing evident signs of the decadence, but in other respects recalling the glories, of the past, especially in its magnificent reredos, mutilated at the Reformation, and hidden for centuries, now again discovered and being munificently restored; still more there is the Codrington Library—the real glory of the College, and the quietly-heroic character of its founder, Christopher Codrington. The College of Wren rightly possesses buildings not unworthy of the architect of St. Paul's; the College of Leland and Tanner, of Linacre and Sydenham, rightly possesses the first College Library in Oxford.\*

We venture, in conclusion, to notice the relations, as they are and might be, of All Souls to the University.

A University, as we conceive, has to promote at once educa-

---

\* Leland does not appear to have been actually a Fellow. See p. 50. We fear that in the Chapel of All Souls, as elsewhere, the 'restorer' is none the less a ruthless iconoclast of works of beauty and dignity, which either he cannot appreciate, or which offend his rigid ideas of uniformity and congruity.

tion and learning. With education within the University, as we have seen from Mr. Burrows' book, All Souls has never had anything to do, and a proposal to introduce undergraduates into the College was very rightly rejected by the University Commission. The establishment of another small College within the University (and notwithstanding the imposing character of its buildings, All Souls could only be a small College) is not to be desired. Such an idea could only be entertained if it formed part of a general scheme for amalgamation of different collegiate foundations. \* It is rather to the interests of learning than of education in the University that All Souls is designed to contribute. A College of students, free to pursue their own separate branches of study, devoting their time to original research, without being disturbed by the harassing care of educational work, is a pleasing idea, but one hardly to be realised. Such societies cannot be created either by Parliament or pious founders. But although a College of students is impracticable, a College of professors is by no means so ; and All Souls appears peculiarly adapted to become the nucleus of such a society. The interests of learning in the University are entrusted to the Professoriate. The Professor in idea represents the latest development and advanced interests of his science, and he is bound to supervise generally its study within the University. Professorial lectures are to give the student a general idea of the subject in its principles, and on its relations to other departments of knowledge, rather than to enable him to answer so many questions in the schools, to be a perpetual protest against cram, and that great danger in the University, of all work being made subsidiary to the examinations. Excellent as the present system of Examinations, in many respects, is, it is not favourable to the pursuit of learning for its own sake. The desire of obtaining a high place in the class-list, is the predominant feeling in the student's mind, and often exercises a prejudicial effect. It is with University not with College work that the Professor is concerned ; nevertheless, it is notorious that owing to the utterly insufficient salaries given to the Professoriate generally in Oxford, the occupants of the chairs are obliged to accept, or to retain, different College offices, and consequently to occupy themselves much with the duties of these sometimes incongruous appointments, or perhaps occasionally to sink the Professor in the Tutor.

As long as the Colleges practically constitute the University, the connection of Professorships with the Colleges is of great value. There may be various opinions as to the College-rights which should be conferred upon Professor Fellows, but at any



rate no duties as regards tutorial work should be imposed upon them. And in a non-educational College like All Souls, they would be entirely free from that burden or temptation, whichever it may be. This is not the place in which to go into details upon the subject, nor to say in what cases new Professorships should be founded, and in what cases the salary of old Professorships should be supplemented; nor can we deal with subsidiary questions, such as the establishment of Readerships, or the value of occasional lectures on special subjects. An interesting paper has recently been circulated\* in Oxford, containing the replies to a letter of inquiry upon these very subjects, addressed by the Vice-Chancellor to the different Boards of Studies. The replies are generally in favour of a considerable increase in the Professoriate, and a general systematisation of University instruction. To go no further at present than the two subjects of Law and History, it seems to us very unsatisfactory that the first University in England should possess no resident Professor either in Roman or in English Law, and no Professor of English Literature, or of Archæology, or of Geography. The College of All Souls, whose special province it is to promote the study of these two departments of learning, would do honour to itself, and act in consonance with its great traditions, if it endeavoured to supply some of these deficiencies.

ART. IX.—1. *Tables of the Number of Criminal Offenders, 1841–1855.*

2. *Judicial Statistics, 1856–1873.*

3. *Correspondence on the Subject of the late Disturbances in the Manufacturing and Mining Districts.* Edited by Rev. John Sinclair. 1842.

‘THE first annual record of the state of crime in England and Wales, as evidenced by the commitments for trial, was prepared in the year 1805, and from that time to the present time (1841) there has been a progressive increase in the numbers committed. Until the peace in 1814 the increase was gradual, but commitments then increased so rapidly that they were nearly doubled in three years. This great increase was maintained until 1821, when a slight decrease took place, and continued during the two following years, at the end of which an increase again commenced, which continued almost uninterruptedly for the ten succeeding years. The tables on the present enlarged plan were then commenced, and the comparison from that time being direct, the number of commitments annually are given. They were in—

1834	..	..	22,451		1838	..	..	23,094
1835	..	..	20,731		1839	..	..	24,443
1836	..	..	20,984		1840	..	..	27,187
1837	..	..	23,612		1841	..	..	27,760

These figures do not show any decrease of commitments; on the contrary, the temporary decrease in 1835 and 1836 was followed by a large increase, which has not since suffered any check, and comparing the average of the first three years of the above period with the last year, this increase is almost 30 per cent. In 1841, as compared with the preceding year, the increase amounted to only 2·1 per cent., but it follows two years in which the aggregate increase exceeded 16 per cent.\*

Such is the introduction to the official tables of criminal statistics for 1841 in the Parliamentary Blue-book. As in some manner explaining the cause of this growth of crime, we make some quotations from 'Correspondence on the Subject of the late Disturbances in the Manufacturing and Mining Districts,' published by Archdeacon Sinclair in 1842. It is there stated in one letter:—†

'There cannot here be less than a population of 60,000; and until lately there were but three churches and church schools (and those only Sunday schools) for that large multitude. Two-thirds of the inhabitants are mill operatives. The very want renders the mass of them insensible of, and therefore indifferent to the want, so that no aid can be obtained from them; and many of the masters are in this respect as bad as their men. There is as yet no daily school for the benefit of the operatives in this place; no daily school, save those opened by schoolmasters for their own private emolument, and from which, consequently, the population at large can derive no benefit, while the education given in them is of course merely secular. There are no means to guide the young, who are left therefore to follow the example of their elders; and those elders are almost all unrestrained by the moral precepts and sanctions of the Christian faith. In consequence of this state of things, vice and infidelity most fearfully abound. Not only are there to be found among the population persons so ignorant as to become the followers of every blasphemous and extravagant sect that may spring up, as Southcottians, Mormonites, &c., but infidelity is openly professed. A statistical society, not having any religious object in view, but merely for information, has ascertained that in this township there are above 1100 heads of families who profess no religion, while in the adjoining town there are above 200. Now connect this with the fact that it was in this neighbourhood that the late extensive commotion commenced—it was the populace of this

\* 'Criminal Tables for 1846,' p. 5. It would be difficult for statistics to be more complete or better arranged than are those in these Blue Books.

† 'Correspondence,' p. 8.

place that marched to Manchester and all the surrounding districts. Where infidelity and ignorance are so strong, thence this insurrection took its rise. And it has been stated to me by a gentleman long resident here, that he never knew a disturbance among the manufacturing population in which this neglected township did not take a lead.'

Another writes :—\*

'The moral condition of the people is as bad as it is possible for it to be. Vice is unrebuked, unabashed; moral character is of no value. The bad are employed both in factories and private houses as readily as the virtuous. Unchastity is no disgrace, and no hindrance either to employment or to marriage.'

A third writes :—†

'The want of church schools in this neighbourhood is most remarkable. In all the great towns of the district, containing from 10,000 to 30,000 inhabitants, there is seldom more than one public school for the children of the poor, and sometimes none at all; and even these very coldly and indifferently supported. It well deserves remembrance that in Staleybridge, containing 26,000 inhabitants, the place in which the late disturbances originated, and where only they still remain unquelled, up to the commencement of the present year there was no public school of any kind.'

With a quotation from a speech by Lord John Russell in 1839, delivered in his place in Parliament after the Chartist rising, and cited in one of these letters, we will bring these extracts to a close :—‡

'There are in the manufacturing districts very large masses of people who have grown up in a state of society which it is both lamentable and appalling to contemplate. They have not grown up among the concomitants of an ordinary state of society, under the hand of early instruction, with places of worship to attend, with their opinions of property moulded by seeing it devoted to charitable and social objects, with a fair and gradual subordination of ranks; but it is in many cases a society necessarily composed of the working classes with the few persons who employ their labour, but with whom they have little other connection, and unhappily receiving, neither in schools nor places of worship, that religious and moral instruction which is necessary to knit together the inhabitants and classes of a great country.'

It would be easy to illustrate this subject still further from a variety of sources, and to show from the investigations of a Parliamentary Committee the worse than heathen ignorance in which a large portion of the working population was suffered to

---

\* Correspondence, p. 11.

† Ibid., p. 15.

‡ Ibid., p. 18.

grow up. But it is unnecessary to do so, as it is not our purpose to attempt the impossible task of minutely tracing the connection between crime and ignorance of revealed truth, between offences against the law and absence of religious training. We are content to place before our readers explanations of the rapid growth of crime in certain parts of the country, given at the time by persons qualified by their position to judge, and to contrast with the state of things then existing, the more recent statistics of crime, and the present condition of affairs.

Let us, then, first examine the number of commitments since 1841. By changes in dealing with certain classes of crime, allowances will have to be made, but of these we will speak hereafter. The numbers stand as follows:—

1842..	..	31,309	1853..	..	27,057	1864..	..	19,506
1843..	..	29,591	1854..	..	29,359	1865..	..	19,614
1844..	..	26,542	1855..	..	25,972	1866..	..	18,849
1845..	..	24,303	1856..	..	19,437	1867..	..	18,971
1846..	..	25,107	1857..	..	20,269	1868..	..	20,091
1847..	..	28,833	1858..	..	17,855	1869..	..	19,318
1848..	..	30,349	1859..	..	16,674	1870..	..	17,578
1849..	..	27,816	1860..	..	15,999	1871..	..	16,269
1850..	..	26,813	1861..	..	18,326	1872..	..	14,801
1851..	..	27,960	1862..	..	20,001	1873..	..	14,893
1852..	..	27,510	1863..	..	20,818			

There were two Acts of Parliament passed during this period which affect these returns. The first was an Act for the more speedy trial and punishment of juvenile offenders, passed in 1847. Its object was to enable two magistrates to deal summarily with offenders whose age did not exceed fifteen years, who had stolen or embezzled property of a value not exceeding forty shillings. It will be seen from the figures above that this Act exercised no appreciable influence upon the number of commitments. The other was an Act passed in 1855 for diminishing expense and delay in the administration of justice in certain cases. It authorized the Justices of the Peace at Petty Sessions to deal summarily with persons charged with simple larceny, or with stealing from the person, or larceny as a clerk or servant; but it limited the punishment they could inflict to imprisonment for six months, and in all cases it gave to the person accused the power of claiming to be tried at the next Sessions or Assizes. The effect of this Act is thus described in the official returns for 1856:—

\* ‘The commitments for trial in the last year show an unprece-

\* ‘Criminal Statistics for 1856,’ pp. vii. viii.

dented decrease, especially when the decrease in the previous year is considered. This must be largely, but not wholly, attributed to the extended powers of Justices to deal summarily in cases of larceny under the Criminal Justice Act, 18 and 19 Vict. c. 126, which has been in operation over the whole of the year. This would refer, however, only to the lesser offences of stealing, while it might have been feared on the other hand that the almost total abandonment of transportation, and the return of large numbers temporarily removed from England by the war, would lead to the increase of the offences of violence in a greater ratio than proves to be the case. On this latter point the state of commitments bears a very gratifying comparison with that at the close of the war in 1815, when the total of the commitments was immediately doubled, and the offences of the gravest description bore their full proportion in this sudden increase.'

These remarks apply to every year subsequent to 1855; our readers, therefore, in comparing the number of criminals in more recent years with those of an earlier period must take this into the account. It will help us to judge of the allowance to be made if we remember that the average annual number of commitments for all kinds of offences against property without violence during the five years preceding the passing of the Act, was 20,212; during the five years which succeeded its becoming law, 12,370; and during the five years ending with 1871 it was 12,726. After making this allowance, the result is far from unsatisfactory, when we remember the great additions which have been made to the population of the country. The number of criminals is not much more than half in 1873, out of twenty-three millions of people, of what it was in 1841, out of sixteen millions: or, if we take into consideration the addition which ought to be made for the reason just assigned, it is about three-fourths now of what it was at the earlier date. In other words, whilst the growth of population has been nearly 45 per cent., crime has actually diminished by about 25 per cent. When we compare the character of the offences committed, we find that there is no increase in any class of offences at all comparable to the increase of population. In the official statistics crimes are classed under six heads. The first contains all offences against the person. In 1834 there were 2455 persons committed for such crimes, in 1856, 1919, and in 1871, 2175. The second division comprises offences against property with violence. Here the numbers were 1459 in 1834, 2258 in 1856, and 1509 in 1871. The third division is the one affected by the Criminal Justices Act of 1855; it includes all offences against property without violence; and we find such offences reduced from 16,608 in 1834, and 13,670 in 1856, to 11,265 in 1871. The fourth  
division

division exhibits the number of commitments for malicious offences against property. These have increased from 162 in 1834, and 180 in 1856, to 197 in 1871. The fifth division shows the number of forgers and offenders against the currency laws; in 1834 there were 431, 893 in 1856, and in 1871, 483. The last division includes a variety of offences, which cannot be classified under any of the foregoing heads—such as treason, sedition, poaching, perjury; and here there is a very large decrease, the numbers being 1336 in 1834, 517 in 1856, and 640 in 1871. If we look at the intervening years, we find that they present no special features which interfere with the conclusions to be drawn from what has been just stated. Of the magnitude of the crimes committed, the only index we could have would be the punishments inflicted; but, for reasons which will presently be stated it will be seen that, under existing circumstances, any argument drawn from such a comparison would be completely fallacious.

These figures require to be supplemented with further information to make the impression they give of the criminal state of the country at all complete.\* The deterrents from crime, and the hindrances to its successful commission, as well as the chances of discovery, have to be taken into account before we can be satisfied that we are safe in the conclusions we draw from such statistics.

With respect to the deterrents from crime, the whole character of the punishments awarded has been changed; our criminal code, instead of being almost Draconic, now verges on the opposite extreme. This is, perhaps, better shown by a comparison between the number of persons capitally sentenced and executed at the two periods than it would be by a statement of the changes made in the law. In the seven years ending 1820, 7107 persons were sentenced to death, of whom 649 were executed; in the following seven years, 7952 were so sentenced, of whom 494 were executed; and in the seven years ending with 1834, 8483 persons were condemned to die, of whom 355 were executed; whilst in the seven years ending 1871, only 140 persons were sentenced to death, of whom 59 were executed. This did not arise only or chiefly from a diminution in the number of capital

\* In a letter to the 'Times' of September 2, 1874, Mr. T. B. L. Baker says :—' In 1844 we (County of Gloucester) had just enlarged our gaols (we had seven of them in county, city, and boroughs), and we had room in them all for 800 prisoners, and we were greatly found fault with by the Home Office for not having built more, as from the rapid increase of crime we were certain to be over full in ten years. Thirty years have passed. We have shut up or pulled down six gaols out of the seven, and the largest number of prisoners at any one time, in 1872, was 197.'

crimes, but from the altered state of the law. In the official Blue-book for 1841 it is said:—\*

‘The magnitude of the recent changes in the criminal laws will be strongly exemplified when it is stated that, had the offences tried in 1841 been tried under the laws of 1831, the eighty capital sentences which were passed last year would have been increased to 2172.’

A further amelioration in the penal code was made in 1857 by the cessation of transportation as an instrument of punishment, for transportation was considered the sentence next to death in severity:—†

‘The revival of transportation in 1787, like its final abolition in 1857, appears to have been governed by necessity as much as policy; though, looking only to its effect in one point of view, there can be no doubt that it has relieved this country of large numbers of the most dangerous criminals. To preserve a record of how greatly transportation must have tended to keep down the home criminal population, and the demoralisation which surrounds every convict of this class, I have calculated from the original lists the number of offenders transported from England and Wales to Australia, from those first landed down to the last diminished shipment to Western Australia (the only part of the Australian continent to which they have been lately consigned). These numbers classed in each ten years were:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
From 1787 to 1796 ..	3,792	865	4,657
„ 1797 „ 1806 ..	2,568	813	3,381
„ 1807 „ 1816 ..	4,390	1,252	5,642
„ 1817 „ 1826 ..	16,750	1,472	18,222
„ 1827 „ 1836 ..	32,780	4,337	37,117
„ 1837 „ 1846 ..	23,550	3,708	27,258
„ 1847 „ 1856 ..	10,241	1,736	11,977
In the Year 1857 ..	461	..	461
Total .. ..	94,532	14,183	108,715

Let us look next at the means used to protect property and to discover crime. For these we naturally turn to the strength and efficiency of the police force kept on foot at the different periods. The changes which have been made in it are thus well summarized:—‡

‘In the boroughs a police was established in 1835, under the Municipal Corporations Act of the 5 and 6 Will. 4 c. 76, varying from a high degree of efficiency, chiefly in the larger boroughs, to a great want of

\* ‘Tables of the Number of Criminal Offenders, 1841,’ p. 7.

† ‘Judicial Statistics, 1857,’ p. xvii.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. v. vi.

system and efficiency in others, among which the boroughs of least population and progress are the most conspicuous. In the counties a constabulary has been in the course of gradual formation since the passing of the 2 and 3 Vict. c. 93, in the year 1839. In several counties a most efficient police has been formed, and altogether 29 counties and parts of counties had availed themselves of the permissive powers of the Act of 1839, when in 1856 the establishment of a police force throughout the remaining parts of England and Wales was made compulsory by the statute 19 and 20 Vict. c. 69.

‘From this statute the establishment of a uniform system of police must be dated, no locality or jurisdiction is exempted for which a police had not been previously provided. Up to this time in many extensive districts no other provision had been made for the protection of life and property than such as might be obtained from the unpaid, untrained parish constable, unwillingly selected for his year of duty, no other means at hand for the prompt pursuit of the most atrocious or the most subtle criminals. While for many years the amendment of the laws for the punishment of criminals had been one of the prominent cares of the legislature, no general provisions were enacted for the prevention of crimes and the pursuit of offenders. This is the office of a paid, trained police; and the numerous enactments passed for the custody and punishment of offenders would not probably have so long preceded a care for the prevention of offences had not a constitutional jealousy of police systems, which has, I trust, disappeared, stood in the way.’

Since the passing of this Act, the strength of the police force has been steadily growing, its efficiency has been tested, and its general utility acknowledged. At the census of 1861 the total police and constabulary force gave one for every 937 of the population; at the census of 1871 there was one for every 828; last year there was one for every 795. In 1871 there were 27,425 men engaged in this work, including Commissioners, Superintendents, Chief Constables of Counties, and Head Constables of Boroughs, and the expenditure was almost two and a quarter millions; last year the number of men engaged had risen to 28,550, and the cost to 2,567,491*l*.

There is another point to be examined before we have before us such materials as are within our reach, to enable a fair comparison to be drawn as to the worth of the statistics with which we commenced. What are the chances of discovery now when compared with what they were thirty years since? Unfortunately, our information on this head is incomplete; it is only since 1857 that we have returns of the number of crimes committed. Up to that time we are told how many persons were committed for trial, and how many of these were convicted, and how many acquitted. But this tells but imperfectly the amount of crime of which the perpetrators escaped detection. More-  
over,



over, it does not even fairly tell of the completeness or incompleteness of the evidence produced against the persons charged with crime. For it is clear that juries were much biassed in the verdicts they gave by the sentence which was likely to follow. If the probable sentence seemed to them excessive, they demanded an amount of proof far beyond what would have sufficed under other circumstances. This is clearly shown by the following statement:—\*

‘It may be worthy of remark here, in reference to the change made in the punishment for rape, that in the three years 1835–6–7 when executions for this offence had not ceased, the numbers convicted were 19, acquitted 165, or little more than one conviction to nine acquittals. In 1839–40–41, during which and the preceding year no executions for rape had taken place, the numbers convicted amounted to 61, acquitted 150, and the proportion was raised to 1 conviction to 2·4 acquittals.’

The proportion between the numbers convicted and acquitted has not very materially varied when our view is extended to the whole number of criminals, and perhaps what difference there is may be accounted for by applying the fact just alleged to the various classes of offences for which the punishment has been mitigated. The census years will sufficiently illustrate this point, adding to them 1834 as the first year for which we have complete statistical returns.

Year.	Convicted.	Acquitted.	Proportion.
1834	15,995	6,456	1 to 2·47
1841	20,280	7,480	1 ,, 2·71
1851	21,579	6,359	1 ,, 3·39
1861	13,879	4,423	1 ,, 3·13
1871	11,946	4,283	1 ,, 2·8

Since 1857 these statistical returns give us the number of offences committed, in addition to the information previously furnished. In that year the returns were far from being complete. They showed—†

‘57,273 crimes committed;  
32,031 persons apprehended; and  
17,861 persons committed or bailed for trial.

\* ‘Tables of Criminal Offenders, 1841,’ p. 7.

† ‘Judicial Statistics, 1857,’ pp. vii. viii.

‘But it is necessary to state that in comparing the number of the crimes committed with the number of offenders apprehended, some grounds of difference will exist. Several persons often participate in one crime, and on the other hand many crimes are committed by the same person. Again, when compared from year to year, the crime and the criminal may not appear in the same return, for in crimes committed towards the end of the year, the offenders may not be apprehended until the commencement of the following year. Subject to these remarks, I would add that the returns show that in the crimes against the person, the number of persons apprehended equal, and in many cases exceed, the number of offences committed; while in attempts upon the dwelling, burglary, house-breaking, shop-breaking, &c., including sacrilege, the apprehensions are 2084 persons to 5428 offences committed; in robbery and attempts to rob, 854 apprehensions to 1029 offences committed.’

In 1861 the number of crimes committed is stated to have been 50,809, whilst 27,174 persons were apprehended; in 1866 the numbers were very similar, there having been 50,549 crimes committed, and 27,190 persons apprehended; in 1871, with diminished numbers the proportions were not materially altered, the crimes committed being returned as 45,149, whilst 23,919 persons were apprehended.

It is difficult to apply the considerations which have been set forth with any degree of certainty to the criminal tables at the commencement of this article. Take for example the relations between the amount of discovered and undiscovered crime. If the proportions were the same in 1842 that they were in 1871, the numerical improvement which has taken place is greater than those tables show; but with the improved condition of the police force, and its complete diffusion all over the country, it is only fair to suppose that a much larger proportion of offenders is now brought to justice than was the case thirty years since. On the other hand, when our endeavour is to ascertain the amount of criminality or moral evil that there is in the country, we must assume that the same increased efficiency in the police force has proved an effectual deterrent from crime, and that in many cases offences have not been committed, because of the increased chance of discovery.

But it may be said that although there has been a considerable decrease in more serious crimes, there has been more than a proportionate increase in minor offences. There is some truth in such a statement, for the number of offences summarily dealt with has grown. During the five years ending with 1856, the average annual number of commitments for lesser offences was 100,411; in the five years ending with 1861, 112,632; in the five years

years ending with 1866, 119,951; and in the five following years, 136,070. These figures at first sight seem very discouraging; but if we examine them closely our disappointment will be much diminished. We shall find that they represent \* ‘in a great degree the vices rather than the crimes of the population’; and that our improved position with respect to criminals emboldens those who have to administer the law to deal with such cases in a way upon which they would never have ventured had the returns of serious crimes been less favourable than they are. For the earlier years detailed statistics are not furnished in the Blue-books as they are in the later ones; but a comparison between 1861 and 1871 will be sufficient for our purpose. In 1861 there were 110,800 persons committed for minor offences; in 1871 there were 145,766. These offenders so punished were taken from a much larger class brought before the magistrates, of whom a considerable portion were dismissed with fines, or upon finding sureties, or were sent to Reformatories, or were handed over to the military or naval authorities, or were acquitted. A comparison of the numbers charged for the different offences so dealt with at the two periods will furnish the best guide to the amount of criminality. In 1861, 82,196 persons were charged with being drunk and disorderly; in 1871, 142,343. In 1861, 26,331 persons were apprehended under the Vagrancy Laws; in 1871, 39,532. In 1861 there were 33,350 offenders against Local Acts and Borough Bye-Laws; in 1871 the number was increased to 38,333. In 1861, 19,900 persons were taken into custody for violating the laws regulating Highways, Turnpikes, Railways, and Carriages; in 1871, the number was 29,408. In 1861 there were 17,651 offenders against the Police Acts; in 1871, 19,645. In 1861, 10,827 persons were accused of violating the laws regulating Licensed Victuallers and the sale of Beer; in 1871 the number was 11,004. In 1861, 10,393 persons were charged with offences against laws relating to Servants, Apprentices, and Masters; in 1871 the number was 10,810. In 1861, 6474 persons were accused of using fraudulent weights and measures; in 1871 the number was reduced to 4989. Under the Mutiny Acts there were 4578 charges in 1861; 3654 in 1871. In 1861, 6282 persons had to answer for alleged offences against the Poor Law Acts; in 1871 there were 8939. In 1861, 3728 persons were accused of causing nuisances, or otherwise offending against sanitary laws; whilst in 1871 there were 8642 charges of a like kind. In 1871 there appears an item which finds no place in

\* *Judicial Statistics, 1857,* p. ix.

1861—it is for breaches of the peace, want of sureties, &c.—and under this head there were 18,050 persons charged. The commitments of 1861 included 13,591 debtors, and persons committed by civil process; those of 1871, 9232.

An examination of these details will show that the two great causes of increase are drunkenness and temper, leading men to disobey regulations by local or other authorities. We would not speak lightly of either offence, but in estimating the moral condition of the country they rank very differently to crimes of violence or dishonesty. At a time when luxury so much abounds, and when higher wages place the means of self-indulgence within the reach of so much larger a number of persons, it is not surprising, though much to be regretted, that such offences should increase. Moreover, it is to be noted that with increased vigilance on the part of the police,\* offenders are now charged before the magistrates who would have certainly not been apprehended a few years since. We ought also to remember that our sanitary laws have created offences which, until lately, were unknown; as *e.g.*, by making vaccination compulsory, by making penal the adulteration of food, &c. We may now expect to find the list of offences still further increased by charges under the compulsory Bye-Laws of the Education Act of 1870.

But there is further evidence serving to illustrate our condition with respect to crime, to which we would call attention. Since the construction of a complete system of police all over the country in 1857, there has been inserted in the official statistics a statement of the numbers of the criminal classes known to the police. It must be difficult to decide the exact value of such returns; for it seems natural to expect that when an evil doer knows himself to be suspected by the police he will seek an early opportunity of changing his residence, and that in such a way as would make it difficult to trace him. On the other hand, the poorer classes find it no easy matter to recommence life where they are utterly unknown, and many of them shrink from making such a venture. Another element of uncertainty must arise from varying modes of judging persons to be of the suspected classes, and of retaining or removing their

---

\* 'In 1840 our (county of Gloucester) police began to work, and detected many more crimes, and procured the prosecution of many slight offences which had before been considered not worth notice, and the numbers so tried rose from 537 in 1834 to 797 in 1842. Yet, though the detection and the noticing slight offences continued, by 1846 they had lowered again to 559.'—*Letter to the 'Times,'* Sept. 2, 1874, from Mr. T. B. L. Baker.

names from lists of such classes. Taking, however, such returns for what they may be worth, they tell us that whereas in 1861, counties with a population of 11,720,263 had 46,250 known or suspected wrong doers, or 3·94 out of every thousand of their inhabitants; the same counties in 1871, with a population increased by a million, had only 33,077 known or suspected criminals, or 2·59 to every thousand of the people. In boroughs containing in 1861, 5,124,726 people, there were 16,012 persons against whom the police felt it their duty to guard the rest of the community; whilst in 1871, in the same boroughs then numbering 6,056,202 inhabitants, the suspected had fallen to 13,521. So that whilst in 1861, 3·12 out of every thousand were reckoned as belonging to the criminal classes, in 1871 the proportion had fallen to 2·19. But for the metropolis diminution to a still lower point is claimed; there in 1861, with 3,221,235 people, 5286 persons, or 1·67 in every thousand of the population, were regarded as belonging to the criminal classes; in 1871, with 3,883,092 people, the suspected offenders were only 3546, or ·91 out of every thousand. It seems a probable suggestion to make from the above figures that the outskirts of the metropolis and large boroughs are the favourite haunts of suspected persons; this would place them beyond the jurisdiction of the more numerous police forces, and cause them to be reckoned in the counties, and not in the boroughs or in the metropolis.

The return of crimes committed scarcely bears out this favourable estimate of the diminution in the number of criminals, as they were reported to be 45,149 in 1871, against 50,809 in 1861. We shall give the clearest idea of the extent to which crime and vice exist in the different parts of the country by inserting a comparative view of the number of crimes committed in each county in proportion to the number of its inhabitants in the years 1861 and 1871; and also of the number of persons summarily proceeded against at those two periods. We would remind our readers that we have already described the kinds of offences which are thus dealt with, and we have enumerated them for each of those census years on the opposite page. It will be observed from these tables that the diminution of crime is found in nearly every county; whilst the increase of minor offences is equally general.

The number of births registered as illegitimate is not on the increase. In 1842 there were 34,796 such births registered; in 1852, 42,482; in 1862, 45,222; and in 1872, 44,766.

	INDICTABLE OFFENCES. Proportion to Population.		OFFENCES DETERMINED SUMMARILY. Proportion to Population.	
	1871.	1861.	1871.	1861.
Bedford .. .. .	1 in 1160	1 in 1176	1 in 88	1 in 127
Berks .. .. .	1 " 789	1 " 640	1 " 73	1 " 77
Bucks .. .. .	1 " 814	1 " 615	1 " 63	1 " 84
Cambridge .. .. .	1 " 958	1 " 956	1 " 120	1 " 169
Chester .. .. .	1 " 490	1 " 318	1 " 40	1 " 46
Cornwall .. .. .	1 " 2448	1 " 1260	1 " 94	1 " 106
Cumberland .. .. .	1 " 1053	1 " 941	1 " 48	1 " 68
Derby .. .. .	1 " 719	1 " 1060	1 " 50	1 " 66
Devon .. .. .	1 " 1445	1 " 849	1 " 71	1 " 92
Dorset .. .. .	1 " 1143	1 " 743	1 " 61	1 " 128
Durham .. .. .	1 " 1479	1 " 1120	1 " 23	1 " 37
Gloucester .. .. .	1 " 858	1 " 626	1 " 49	1 " 70
Hereford .. .. .	1 " 656	1 " 381	1 " 46	1 " 44
Hertford .. .. .	1 " 928	1 " 1050	1 " 65	1 " 92
Huntingdon .. .. .	1 " 1179	1 " 1189	1 " 81	1 " 109
Lancaster .. .. .	1 " 251	1 " 167	1 " 22	1 " 26
Leicester .. .. .	1 " 792	1 " 570	1 " 67	1 " 78
Lincoln .. .. .	1 " 1062	1 " 684	1 " 55	1 " 68
Metropolis* .. .. .	1 " 279	1 " 262	1 " 36	1 " 37
Monmouth .. .. .	1 " 653	1 " 539	1 " 34	1 " 47
Norfolk .. .. .	1 " 961	1 " 586	1 " 95	1 " 107
Northampton .. .. .	1 " 886	1 " 764	1 " 77	1 " 88
Northumberland .. .. .	1 " 581	1 " 561	1 " 35	1 " 53
Nottingham .. .. .	1 " 1021	1 " 598	1 " 54	1 " 69
Oxford .. .. .	1 " 988	1 " 733	1 " 72	1 " 83
Rutland .. .. .	1 " 2207	1 " 840	1 " 69	1 " 109
Salop .. .. .	1 " 835	1 " 599	1 " 43	1 " 46
Somerset .. .. .	1 " 1039	1 " 660	1 " 66	1 " 71
Southampton .. .. .	1 " 672	1 " 359	1 " 63	1 " 69
Stafford .. .. .	1 " 653	1 " 444	1 " 33	1 " 38
Suffolk .. .. .	1 " 910	1 " 528	1 " 108	1 " 121
Sussex .. .. .	1 " 796	1 " 373	1 " 95	1 " 119
Warwick .. .. .	1 " 568	1 " 465	1 " 39	1 " 56
Westmoreland .. .. .	1 " 910	1 " 800	1 " 73	1 " 96
Wilts .. .. .	1 " 1346	1 " 1362	1 " 95	1 " 108
Worcester .. .. .	1 " 787	1 " 387	1 " 60	1 " 66
York, East Riding .. .. .	1 " 794	1 " 896	1 " 44	1 " 52
West Riding .. .. .	1 " 623	1 " 579	1 " 46	1 " 52
North Riding .. .. .	1 " 939	1 " 925	1 " 36	1 " 53
Anglesey .. .. .	1 " 1020	1 " 2730	1 " 106	1 " 117
Brecon .. .. .	1 " 1151	1 " 725	1 " 36	1 " 47
Cardigan .. .. .	1 " 3338	1 " 3283	1 " 76	1 " 201
Carmarthen .. .. .	1 " 1361	1 " 923	1 " 65	1 " 79
Carnarvon .. .. .	1 " 1278	1 " 968	1 " 64	1 " 102
Denbigh .. .. .	1 " 1347	1 " 1901	1 " 88	1 " 84
Flint .. .. .	1 " 1695	1 " 1967	1 " 49	1 " 68
Glamorgan .. .. .	1 " 780	1 " 434	1 " 37	1 " 47
Merioneth .. .. .	1 " 1553	1 " 2030	1 " 98	1 " 110
Montgomery .. .. .	1 " 697	1 " 539	1 " 58	1 " 66
Pembroke .. .. .	1 " 1460	1 " 83	1 " 95	1 " 83
Radnor .. .. .	1 " 1338	1 " 507	1 " 48	1 " 85

\* No proportions are included in the above lists for Essex, Surrey, and Kent, as well as for Middlesex; as parts of these counties are included in the metropolis.

The amount of juvenile crime has shown considerable diminution. In 1856 there were 1990 children under 12 years of age committed to prison, and 13,981 under 16 years; in 1860, when the numbers were fewest, there were 1480 under 12, and 8029 under 16; last year there were 1482 under 12, and 9359 under 16. The first certified Reformatory school was opened in 1854, under powers conveyed by the Statute 17 and 18 Vict. c. 86, when 23 juvenile prisoners were sent to it; in 1861 the number of such schools had increased to 51, and 1001 boys and 236 girls were committed to them; at the end of 1871 the number of Reformatories had not increased, but there were then being trained in them 3522 boys and 846 girls; in 1873 there were two more establishments, and at the end of the year, 3625 boys and 890 girls were remaining in them under detention.

With respect to the amount of education possessed by criminals there is, excepting under one head, little change. In 1836, 33·52 per cent. of the criminals were unable to read and write; in 1871, 34·1 per cent. were in a like state of ignorance; in 1873, 33·4 per cent.; in 1836, 52·33 per cent. were able to read and write imperfectly; in 1871, 62·3 per cent.; and in 1873, 63·1 per cent. were in that condition; in 1836, 10·56 per cent. were able to read and write well; in 1871, 3·2 per cent. were equally instructed; in 1836, ·91 per cent. of the criminals had received instruction superior to reading and writing well; in 1871 and in 1873, ·2 per cent. were thus better educated. These facts could not be ascertained concerning 2·68 of the convicts in 1836, whilst the unknown quantity was reduced to ·2 in 1871. The most unexpected feature in these returns is that the standard of education was higher amongst the criminals at the earlier period than at the later; the number of those who were able to read and write well being more than three times greater in 1836 than in 1871. In the years immediately succeeding 1836 we find the number of criminals thus described much higher than in later returns; in 1837, it was 9·46 per cent.; in 1838, 9·77; in 1839, 10·07; in 1840, 8·29; in 1841, 7·4; whilst in 1868, it was only 2·9 per cent.; in 1869, 3·; in 1870, 3·1, and in 1873, 3·. Ought this to be attributed in any way to the fact that at the earlier period a large portion of the education was given in private venture schools that were practically secular? whilst at the later period religious teaching was combined with secular in nearly all schools?

So far as it is safe to draw inferences from these statistics they show that the great mass of our poorer population who have used our existing schools to any purpose have been thereby trained to avoid flagrant crime; but that the principles im-  
planted

planted have not sufficed to root out vicious tendencies. They also confirm the impression that there is amongst us a criminal class, that has been very partially reached as yet by philanthropic efforts, and whose children are allowed to grow up without any education. That this must be so is proved by fully one-third of the persons committed being utterly unable to read or write; it cannot be pretended that these were ever at school; though no doubt the larger portion, if not the whole, of the remaining two-thirds, of whom there are few who can do more than read and write imperfectly, were for a longer or shorter period, more or less irregular attendants at school. If the system of compulsory education can reach these waifs and strays of society, it will accomplish a great work, and then we may perhaps hope that the next thirty years may achieve results at least equal to what the last thirty years have done.

The comparison between the present state of crime, and what it was forty years since, certainly shows signs of improvement, though the result is very far from being all we could wish. Most people will agree that there is much to encourage in the figures that have been placed before us, whilst about the causes of the improvement thus indicated, there will be great differences of opinion. For our own part we do not hesitate to attribute our preservation from increased crime, under the manifold temptations from the growth of wealth and luxury, and the wider gulf which consequently separates the rich from the poor, and also the many hopeful signs exhibited by the criminal tables which we have been examining, chiefly to the religious education given in our primary schools, and to the greater reverence generally felt for religion. As thoughtful persons at the earlier period traced much of the growing evil among the poorer classes to their lack of religious education and sound moral training, and at great cost and with much self-denial supplied these priceless blessings for them; it seems to us that it would be ungracious as well as untrue to deny to those efforts so originated the credit of much of the improvement that has taken place. Those who are jealous of the power of religion, and are eager to attribute to any influences, rather than to those of Christianity, whatever advances may be made in the morality or social well-being of our people, may claim for advancing civilisation, improved legislation, secular education, greater material prosperity, a more efficient police, benevolent efforts for assisting criminals on their being discharged from prison, reformatory schools, the honour of elevating the lower grades of society. We are far from denying to all or to any of these a portion of the credit; but we believe that all of them would have been inoperative for good without



that basis of sound moral training which has been imparted chiefly in our national schools; and which has been subsequently fostered by a higher tone of religious teaching in our churches, and by those more efficient pastoral ministrations on the part of the clergy which have certainly been felt in all parts of the country.

But whilst claiming that considerable improvement is to be found; it is but too obvious that very much more remains to be done than has been yet accomplished, and that the present condition of things is very far from being satisfactory. Greater reverence for law has been successfully inculcated; a sense of the wrongfulness of dishonesty and of some crimes has been implanted in the minds of the people; a feeling of moral responsibility is more widely entertained; a small awakening to the idea that mere selfishness ought not to be the guide of a man's life has been made; brutality has been lessened. We do not claim that much more than this has been effected; this the criminal statistics certainly show, and apart from those returns we think there is abundant proof that this has been accomplished. As evidence of it, we may point to the diminution, though alas! not complete cessation of amusements, such as dog or cock-fighting, prize-fighting, bull-baits; to the indignation now aroused amongst the poorer classes by the still too frequent acts of gross brutality towards women; to the general esteem in which probity is held, and to the different weight which would be given to character in the selection of a person for any public office in this country and in some others, for example, in the United States.

- ART. X.—1. *Six Judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.* By W. G. Brooke, M.A. London, 1872.  
 2. *Legal Ritual.* By J. M. Dale. London, 1871.  
 3. *An Act for the Regulation of Public Worship*, 1874.

**T**HE last two years have brought changes to the Church of England, which may materially affect its position as a National Church.

The Judicature Act of 1873 changed the Supreme Court of Appeal, hitherto a mixed court of clergymen and laymen, into a purely secular court. The Public Worship Regulation Act of the last session has created a new tribunal and course of procedure for causes connected with public worship. One knows not whether to wonder more at the silence and indifference with which the former change was received, or at the unreasonable clamour that greeted

greeted the latter. Both sprang from the same causes, working deeply through many past years. The change in the Appellate Court passed suddenly near the close of a session; and Parliament, becoming conscious of the greatness of the change it had made so hastily, seemed partly to retrace its steps in hastening to introduce a plan for episcopal assessors to the Supreme Court in all Church cases. The Public Worship Regulation Bill, introduced late in the session, altered, transformed, amended at every stage in the House of Lords, left that House with little hope that it would find its way to port through the storms and the enforced calms of an expiring session. If it did not perish for want of friends, want of time would complete its destruction. And when the late Prime Minister produced a string of resolutions, going to the foundations on which Churches rest, people began to speculate on the fate of the measure of 1875, seeing that for the measure of 1874 the late Prime Minister had provided a protracted and a cruel death. But its fate was not decided so. The House of Commons adopted the measure with a passionate enthusiasm, which never grew weaker to the very end. A measure of sufficient importance to draw the late Premier from his repose, a measure distasteful to no small section of the Cabinet, passed without a division, after a debate of great power and interest, well calculated to sustain, or even to raise, the dignity of the House of Commons. Relieved from a position of great difficulty as head of a divided Cabinet, Mr. Disraeli, interpreting the will of the assembly, which he understands perhaps better than any man living, adopted the measure at this point. He was wrong in saying that the measure was one to put down Ritualism, for it is applicable alike to slovenly neglect and fantastic tricks of worship. But he was right in his interpretation of the will of the House of Commons, which accepted so eagerly, as a remedy against sacerdotal pretension and attempts which have sickened the heart of the constituencies, a measure of procedure neutral in itself and capable of other and wider applications.

The events of these two years, whatever be their result, must be an epoch in the religious movement which began in 1833.\* For forty years England has been the scene of a religious struggle, only second in importance to the Reformation itself. The story of its beginning is well known. The Reform Bill

---

\* 'The following Sunday, July 14th, Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University pulpit. It was published under the title of "National Apostasy." I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833.—*J. H. Newman, 'Apologia,'* p. 100.

had put representative government in the power of a far larger number; Irish bishoprics were suppressed; Welsh sees were threatened; German rationalism threatened to sweep over the land as a flood; dismay and sorrow were spread through the ranks of the clergy and of the more thoughtful laity. But there was one mind, at least, which saw in this great crisis occasion for more than sorrow or dismay. Wandering over Europe, comparing with the distractions of his own Church the ideal of another, John Henry Newman, logician, poet, mystic, with a spirit as devout as it was inquiring and critical, was stricken with sickness at Castro Giovanni, and had time to meditate on the waste condition of his own Church. Before the sickness and after it, he felt and said, 'I have a work to do in England.' A renewed attack of illness at Lyons, from over-travelling, only intensified the desire which it opposed. He hastened to England. Keble's sermon, preached five days after, touched a string that was vibrating already. At least a few earnest spirits would stand in the breach to confront the 'National Apostasy.' Newman, Keble, Froude, Pusey, Rosc, Palmer, were no despicable band,—but the genius of Newman was its strength. The reactionary movement was begun. One peculiarity marked it from the first—its attitude towards the Church of Rome.

'I have a supreme confidence,' writes Newman, 'in our cause. We were upholding that primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and which was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and by the Anglican services. That ancient religion had well-nigh faded out of the land through the political changes of the last hundred and fifty years, and it must be restored. It would be in fact a second Reformation—a better reformation—for it would be a return not to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth.'

But the divines of the Caroline period had no leanings to Rome, such as have marked the present movement from the first. 'I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation,' writes Froude in January 1834; and in December of the same year he had advanced a good deal: 'Really I hate the Reformation more, and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalistic spirit they set afloat is the *ψευδοπροφήτης* of the Revelation.' And Newman, in acknowledging the influence of Froude upon him in this direction,\* reminds us of his own words in 1834:—

'Considering the high gifts and the strong claims of the Church of

---

\* 'Apologia,' p. 126.

Rome and its dependencies on our admiration, reverence, love, and gratitude, how could we withstand it as we do, how could we refrain from being melted into tenderness and rushing into communion with it, but for the word of truth itself, which bid us prefer it to the whole world? \*

From this kind of talk the Caroline divines are almost free. Where admiration, love, and reverence are already engaged, it is likely that the claims of truth will not long resist them. That, at least, was the result with Newman: his mind travelled round to new 'truths' by the circuitous route of the theory of development; but his perversion to Rome was a foregone conclusion. The admiration and the love, indeed, could hardly have existed without some latent persuasion that truth was on that side. The leaning to Rome has been the character of this movement from that time; and now the doctrine of transubstantiation 'rightly explained' is the doctrine of the extreme party, and nothing stands in the way of communion with Rome except the dogma of the Pope's infallibility.

It was a convenient aid to this tendency to allege that the Church of England has no distinctive or definite doctrine, and that her Articles and formularies may, therefore be interpreted into accordance with so-called Catholic truth, the truth of the Tridentine Catechism. Dr. Newman gives this account of the purpose of Tract 90.

'The main thesis of my essay was this:—The Articles do not oppose Catholic teaching, they but partially oppose Roman dogma; they for the most part oppose the dominant errors of Rome. And the problem was to draw the line as to what they allowed and what they condemned. Such being the object which I had in view, what were my prospects of widening and defining their meaning? The prospect was encouraging; there was no doubt at all of the elasticity of the Articles: to take a preliminary instance—the fourteenth was assumed by one party to be Lutheran, by another Calvinistic, though the two interpretations were contradictory to each other; why then should not other Articles be drawn up with a vagueness of an equally intense character?.'—*Newman's 'Apologia.'*

With what logical force, with what fine English to clothe it withal, this object was pursued, those who remember 'Tract 90' can say. Amidst some hard words for the Church of Rome, the writer reaches the conclusion that the Articles of the Church of England do not condemn the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome on Purgatory, on the Invocation of Saints, or on the Mass. But any one who will spend a few hours in

examining the Articles, the Augsburg Confession, and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, will see clearly that the battle of the Reformation was not with 'popular notions' of Roman Catholics, nor with 'popular practice,' nor with existing abuses, but against a Romish doctrine well known and ascertained. Rome, more than any other Church, has been at least consistent with herself. If she has had abusive practices, they have been closely connected with a doctrine. No scheme of doctrine could have been framed which could condemn her practices and leave her dogmas untouched. Cardinal Wiseman had almost gained his point in advance when he denied that there existed anywhere any authoritative teaching in his Church, distinct from the teaching of the Council of Trent. But, with whatever flaws of argument, the conclusion was reached, that one might hold a great many of the conclusions of Rome, even of those which appeared to be in terms contradictory to the Thirty-nine Articles. Thus, 'an assent to the doctrine that faith alone justifies, does not at all preclude the doctrine of works justifying also.'\* It is true that the Article says 'that General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes, and being assemblies of men whereof all are not governed with the spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred;' but this does not apply to any council which, besides being gathered according to the commandment of princes, is gathered by the will of Christ. The Article merely contemplates 'the human prince, and not the King of saints.'† 'The Romish doctrine about Purgatory is a fond thing, vainly invented.' True: but what is the Romish doctrine? Not the doctrine of the Council of Trent, for that had not yet been given forth: not the primitive doctrine; that could not be 'Romish.' Something, perhaps, is condemned which existed at the time of the Articles, and disappeared at the Council of Trent; a harmless condemnation enough; for the doctrine, whatever it was, is gone. The Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints is also a fond thing, vainly invented; but what is it? Invocations are not censurable 'if we mean nothing definite by them.' Perhaps the doctrine condemned is that which the Council of Trent condemned when it says that this Church doth not teach that sacrifice is offered to saints, if invocation and sacrifice can be by possibility brought together.‡ True; the Article says that the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture: but this does not 'deny every kind of change,'

---

\* Tract 90, p. 12.

† 'Apologia,' p. 81.

‡ Tract 90, p. 40.

nor need it be a contradiction of any council.\* No doubt the Article has it that 'the sacrifices of masses, in which. it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.' But this is not 'against the mass in itself, nor against its being an offering for the quick and the dead, for the remission of sins, but against its being viewed as independent of, or distinct from, the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, which is blasphemy.'† We need not go on. Language in such hands is a Lesbian rule<sup>o</sup> of lead, taking the mould of every one's thought. Cranmer and Melancthon might have spared their pains. They were not writing against Rome; rather against some existing corruptions of Catholic doctrine not written down in her creeds. In words of condemnation of Rome, however distinct and vigorous, there is the precious balm of explanation, and no heads need be broken. Black is not so very different from white if the mind approach it by the road of grey. No one who has read the 'Apologia' will dream of accusing Dr. Newman of conscious falsehood; his mind was convinced before he gave forth his startling conclusions. That his better mind soon re-asserted itself is manifest: his was too noble a spirit to sit long under such a mist of confusion. He went to Rome, where he could hold Rome's creed without squaring it with England's Articles. But he has left behind him the evil heritage of a sophistry that has been troubling us ever since. The Church of England is a branch of the Catholic Church; the Catholic doctrine is the Roman doctrine; therefore the Roman doctrine must be to be found in her standards of faith. As it must be there, difficulties of language must not prevent us from seeking it.

What Dr. Newman did for the Articles, an active party has been engaged for the last twenty years and more in doing for the Prayer Book. Of a catholic Church the ritual must be catholic and, therefore, the bald simplicity of the English rite cannot be tolerated. One writer, in words that were thought worth quoting in the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, thus described the correlation of doctrine and ritualism.

'It may be argued that good and vigorous preaching will fill the cravings of the congregations, and make the employment of material stimuli superfluous, if not mischievous. But good preaching is amongst the rarest of good things, much rarer in proportion even than good acting, because it requires a wider range of physical and mental gifts. If very good actors were common, the adventitious aid

---

\* Tract 90, p. 51.

† Ibid., p. 63.

of scenery and properties would be comparatively unimportant, because the harmonious action of all the persons of the drama would be sufficient to create an illusion able to rivet the attention of the spectators. But as the great majority of actors are mere sticks, and even the chief stars are not always shining their best, managers have constantly been compelled to make gorgeous spectacle their main attraction, and a splendid transformation scene or a telling stage procession will draw crowds night after night, even in the absence of any theatrical celebrity. Hence a lesson may be learnt by all who are not too proud to learn from the stage, for it is an axiom in liturgy that no public worship is really deserving of its name unless it be histrionic.—*Rev. Dr. Littledale, in 'The Church and the World.' First Series, 1866.*

It is the business then of those who conduct worship to make it an acted doctrine; to supply the want of efficient actors by accessories of a splendid kind.

We accept this view of the subject that doctrines have been inculcated by means of rites.\* For twenty years and more the most active efforts have been made to bring our worship into harmony with that of the Romish Church, and especially to assimilate holy communion with the mass by 'histrionic' means. This has been the chief battle fought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The judgments of that body have been on the whole unfavourable to these practices; and this must have been all the more galling to the party who adopted them that, in many points, the court below was with them. In two great cases the authority of the Prayer Book as it stands was confirmed, and the power of bringing back usages supposed to be 'catholic,' but not found in the Prayer Book, was denied.

In the former of these two cases, Mr. Mackonochie, 'simply using,' as he says, 'our own liberty as members of the Church of England,' thought himself free to adopt the following practices. He placed on the holy table two lighted candles at noonday at the holy communion. He lifted above his head the paten and the cup when he was consecrating the elements; afterwards he knelt down with his head prone to the ground, when he had replaced the cup on the table. Incense was freely used. The wine to be consecrated was mixed with water. These were the chief changes introduced. In the second case, Mr. Purchas of Brighton, appears to have claimed a larger liberty. A crucifix was borne in procession in the church; and crucifer, and thurifer, and acolytes were about it. A group of acolytes held a crucifix near him when he read the gospel. A crucifix also was above the communion table, and Mr. Purchas did it acts of reverence. Incense was abundant. A 'paschal taper' marked the Easter festival:

festival: a stuffed dove suspended from on high was thought suitable to Whit Sunday. On Palm Sunday branches of palms, sprinkled with holy water, were carried in procession round the church. On Christmas Eve, 'a modelled figure of the infant Saviour' was placed above the credence table. On Ash Wednesday a 'black powder' resembling ashes was taken from the Communion table and rubbed on the foreheads of those who came forward for this purpose. On the Feast of Purification, 'when no artificial light was necessary,' Mr. Purchas distributed candles to the congregation, who then followed their pastor round the chapel, all carrying their candles lighted, and singing. These candles were extinguished for the early part of the communion service, and were all lighted again for the gospel. Water was mingled with the wine, and the paten and the cup were elevated. Round wafers were substituted for the usual bread. A bell was rung at various times in the prayers. 'A mortuary celebration for the repose of a sister' seems to have been marked by the interpolation of a prayer for the departed soul contained in no part of the Prayer Book. The book from which the gospel of the day was read was held by an attendant, and the reader reverently kissed the book. The admission of an acolyte took place before the Lord's table: a candlestick with candle was delivered to him; also 'glass bottles containing water and wine.' Copes were worn at evening service; 'chasubles, albs, and tunics' at holy communion.

The least that can be said upon this curious catalogue is that none of the things contained in it are mentioned in the Prayer Book; that they change the service of the Church to a considerable extent, and that the general direction of the change is to assimilate the communion office to the service of the mass in the Church of Rome. If these practices lay within the range of the liberty of any clergyman, it would have been legally possible that in one country parish the mass might be celebrated by a priest in alb and chasuble, with lights and incense, and many prostrations, ministering the mixed chalice and the wafers, whilst in the adjoining parish the surpliced celebrant, consecrating the usual wheaten bread and the unmingled wine, might plead two centuries of use for his simpler practice, founded on an exact adherence to the Prayer Book. And supposing this diversity to become general, one might well ask of what use it is to include under our system things so different? The broad stream of the Reformation rolls between them. Such a union would be at best mechanical only. The parishioner who should stray from the simpler to the more ornate service would find himself unable to join in a rite stuffed and overlaid with every practice



practice which neither he nor his fathers could bear. 'I could not follow it in my Prayer Book,' complained to her friend a casual worshipper of this kind. 'I have left that at home for many a day,' rejoined her friend. But the courts had nothing to do with consequences, their business was to ascertain the law. And if the work of the Reformation had been done so negligently that all the things then cast out could be introduced again after generations of disuse by any clergyman 'in the exercise of his reasonable liberty,' it was the duty of the courts to expound that state of things, in order that the grievance, if there was one, might find a remedy. It would have been surprising, if after nearly two centuries of utter disuse, it had proved that all these ceremonies were lawful and admissible under the present service book. Vain would have been all the hair-splitting disputes of 1662, vain the small complaints of the Puritans on minor points, if, after all, the Prayer Book was the mass-book still. The liberty of making these changes rests with no responsible author except the clergyman himself. No diocesan, no convocation, no universal consent of public opinion has given them sanction. They may be commenced to-morrow in any church, with as little warrant from authority as Mr. Mackonochie or Mr. Purchas could plead. They may be discontinued by the next incumbent, and then recommenced. But the Church of England, ever since the Prayer Book of 1549, has carried this sentence conspicuous in the front of its formularies :

'Where [wherelas] heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm, some following Salisbury use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, and some of Lincoln; now from henceforth all the realm shall have but one use.'

If, however, these clergymen were right, then we have but exchanged some five or six 'uses' for some thousands. The stuffed dove and *bambino* of Mr. Purchas did not commend themselves to Mr. Mackonochie, who, however, has his own favourite ceremonies; another imaginative clergyman will have his own set of additions. In a well-known watering-place, where a church is named after St. Clement, the congregation were instructed to uplift a festive strain the burden of which was, 'We will go a Clementing,' and one of the most fervent singers of this *refrain* was asked in vain what the process was to which they then pledged themselves. But even supposing that the rites thus added were as seemly as they have been in fact absurd, they are inconsistent with the principle of having 'one use;' and whereas the Church of England has been regulated by Acts of Uniformity, and her fixed ritual has been alternately her

her glory and reproach, it would appear, if Mr. Purchas is right, that she gives room for the widest licence and the wildest caprice.

These then were the principal questions to be solved by the Ecclesiastical Courts and the Committee of Privy Council: Is the ritual of the Church to be sought in the Prayer Book and the Act of Uniformity, or in these as interpreted by ancient canons and by other service books? Is the Prayer Book not only a guide to the ritual, but a complete guide? If it should be decided that it is a complete guide, then most of the matters in dispute would fall away at once, for they are additional rites not mentioned in the Prayer Book. Two points would remain, turning on disputed interpretations of rubrics. It is a wonder that so much importance should have come to attach to two things apparently so insignificant as the dress which the minister should wear at the holy communion and the place at which he should stand. But the Comte de Chambord's white flag stands between him and a possible crown; and these two small points are the white flag of the advanced party.

The Court of Arches, answering these questions in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, laid down the principle that—

‘Whatever is subsidiary to what is ordered [in the Rubrics], and whatever being in itself decent and proper is in accordance with primitive and catholic use, and is not by any fair construction necessarily connected with those Roman novelties which the Church “cut away and clean rejected” (to use the language of the Prayer Book) at the Reformation, is, under restrictions to be mentioned, lawful.’

The restrictions seem to be that the judgment of the Ordinary is to be sought for doubtful things, and that his opinion is to be reviewed, if necessary, by the Archbishop. Here the language of the judgment—a learned and elaborate performance—seems to be somewhat vague. What is subsidiary to the service, and what is not? The learned judge in applying his own principles, decides that the use of incense is ‘not necessarily subsidiary’ to the celebration of the Holy Communion; ‘that it is an ancient, innocent, and pleasing custom,’ but that it is illegal, and must be discontinued. Here, however, the text is altered in the application. ‘Subsidiary’ and ‘necessarily subsidiary,’ are very different; and Mr. Mackonochie would have argued that incense was at least the one if not the other. If it was ‘an ancient, innocent, and pleasing custom,’ it must have been decent and proper, with something to spare; and, on the whole, might have been expected to obtain the protection of the principle laid down. Again, what is ‘primitive and catholic use’? What are Roman novelties? and how are they to be distinguished from

from Roman usages that are not novelties? A whole Tract 90 might be written on such a theme, were there but left a Newman to write it. But such a sentence, expounded in such a tract, would have been fruitful of novelties. The objectionable changes are almost always justified, when they are challenged, upon some such grounds. Every caprice of a fledgling curate is justified on the ground of 'catholic' usage. Every quaint rite which the curate adds to the beautiful order of holy communion, is supposed to be subsidiary to the service. Only the discretion of the Ordinary is interposed; and a method all too summary has been found for dealing with this—that of disregarding it altogether. After that, any number of rites may be added which are at once catholic and singular,—which are subsidiary to and yet subversive of the original office.

The decisions of the Privy Council seem to have rescued the Church from this great danger. In the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, the principle already admitted by the courts ever since 1811, was adopted,—

'that in the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; no omission and no addition can be permitted.'\*

This does not imply that the articles not mentioned in the Rubrics are all inadmissible: hassocks, pews, curtains, seats, an organ, are all used, and are subsidiary to the service, for they supply the means of carrying out its directions. To place lighted candles on the table in daylight was thought 'subsidiary' by the Dean of Arches; but the judgment in *Westerton v. Liddell* stopped far short of this. There must be either 'express directions or implied permission' to use a thing in the Prayer Book, in order to make it lawful.† Thus candles for giving light would stand on a different footing from candles lighted as a ceremony in broad day. Without following minutely a most intricate argument on the present force of old statutes and canons, we may take it that the successive judgments have brought out into broader and broader relief the principle that 'the form or order of service' contains positive directions for public worship; that these directions are meant to be complete; that it matters nothing that a practice is not prohibited, if it is not ordered; want of order is prohibition. 'What the law does not order it forbids.' That Archbishop Walter has ordered lighted candles, and that Lyndwood has explained the order,

---

\* Brooke, *Privy Council Judgments*, p. 74.

† Dr. Stephens in 2nd Report, *Ritual Commission*, p. 352.

will for the future be inadmissible even in an argument before the Courts.

‘ Their lordships are of opinion that it is not open to a minister of the Church, or even to their lordships in advising Her Majesty, as the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of appeal, to draw a distinction in acts which are a departure from, or violation of, the Rubric, between those which are important and those which appear to be trivial. The object of a statute of uniformity is, as its preamble expresses, to produce “an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God,” an object which would be wholly frustrated if each minister, on his own view of the relative importance of the details of the service, were to be at liberty to omit, or add to, or to alter, any of those details.’\*

‘ If the minister be allowed to introduce at his own will variations in the rites and ceremonies that seem to him to interpret the doctrine of the service in a particular direction, the service ceases to be what it was meant to be—common ground upon which all Church people may meet—though they differ about some doctrines. But the Church of England has wisely left a certain latitude of opinion in matters of belief, and has not insisted on a rigorous uniformity of thought, which might reduce her communion to a narrow compass.†

The two Acts of Uniformity of Elizabeth and of Charles, have annulled the injunctions of 1547 and other constitutions referred to ; and thus the rule, and the sufficient rule, of worship is to be sought within the four corners of the Prayer Book.

This is the leading principle that has guided all the decisions of the Privy Council on ritual questions. With a sigh of relief the much-enduring layman may rest from examining them, consoled to feel that he need not get up ‘the Council of Oxford in 1322,’ nor an earlier Council in Wilkins’s ‘Concilia,’ of 1222, in order to ascertain whether the multi-coloured vestments just introduced, and the superfluous candles twinkling in the sunshine, are lawful in the Church of England in the year of grace 1874.

Two questions, however, turn on the interpretation of the Rubrics themselves. We mention them, not so much for their past interest as for the future. It is probable that a great deal of discussion will be spent on them during the next two years, and the efforts of the Ritualist party will be concentrated on them. They are in themselves so small, that some will scarcely give them a serious consideration. That a Church should be endangered and a schism threatened because a clergyman is ordered to stand at a particular part of the table and wear a white garb, and not a coloured, is at first sight humiliating

---

\* Judgment in *Master v. Mackonochie*, in *Brooke*, p. 119.

† Judgment in *Sheppard v. Bennett*, in *Brooke*, p. 233.

enough. But after the Purchas judgment, about 7000 clergymen signed a protest against its ruling on this question of the position of the celebrant; and in the present year, a much smaller number have published a declaration which demands, among other things, that steps should be taken 'to protect clergymen from interference in respect of the position which they may conscientiously feel it their duty to take at the holy table during the communion service': a form of words which assumes that no one else has any rights in the matter, however preposterous or even shameful the acts of a clergyman might be in this particular point. It is not asked that the eastward position may be made legal; but that the clergyman conscientiously assuming *any* position may be safe from interference. But there can be no 'conscientious' binding to any position except that which the Prayer Book orders, whatever it prove to be; for every clergyman has most solemnly bound himself to obey the Prayer Book; and therefore the real question is—What is the lawful position? This we will try to answer, premising that most of the difficulty surrounding the subject, in itself by no means obscure, has arisen from reckless writing about it of those who either did not know the facts, or were precluded by prejudice from weighing them.

The Rubrics that come into question here are two. At the beginning of the service, 'the priest, standing at the north side of the table, shall say, &c.' Before the prayer of consecration, 'when the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the prayer of consecration, as follows.'

Upon these two it may be asked, where is the minister to stand at the commencement of the service? Whither does he remove at the beginning of the prayer of consecration? Does he remain in this place during the prayer of consecration? Does he return to his original place afterwards? In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., the priest stood 'afore the midst of the altar.' In the Prayer Book of 1552, he is directed to stand 'at the north side of the table,' which 'shall stand in the body of the church or in the chancel.' This direction has continued the same in substance ever since, in the revisions of 1559, 1604, and 1662; this is important to remember, because the table did in practice undergo changes of position before the last revision. Now, the plain English of this direction is that the priest stood on the north and faced south. The table being placed 'table-wise' down the church or chancel, with its longer axis east and west,

west, the priest would neither face the whole congregation nor turn quite away from them; he would occupy a middle position, where the congregation could see his acts done at the table and hear his words. Nothing can be plainer so far. But a crowd of critics deny that north is north, and side side. One tells us, that the expression 'right corner' had been ambiguous, as it might be used with relation to the priest in front of, or to the crucifix on the altar; that a Pope cleared it up in 1486, and that the Reformers only put 'north side' to do away with ambiguity as to 'right hand corner,' and that both mean the same thing. In other words, this new direction was only a means of clearing up an old direction of the mass books; although these were to be swept away and used no more, and although altars were done away and tables put in their place. Everything about the mass was at an end; but we are told that the position of the celebrant, and that alone, was left the same. Equally ingenious is this argument: the front of a Roman Catholic altar was divided into three parts, the middle, the left or north, and the right or south; therefore he who would obey the Rubric, would stand at the northern part of the east side of the table. But this connection, we repeat, between altar and table, was exactly what the promoters of the Reformation strove to avoid. The substitution of tables for altars took place all over England in one year.\* It was no temporising or colourable change, for Archbishop Grindal asks later, in his 'Visitation Articles,' 'Whether all altars be utterly taken down and clean removed, even with the foundation, and the place where they stood paved, and the wall whereunto they joined, whited over and made uniform with the rest, so as no breach or rupture appear?'† Another writer divides the Jewish altar of burnt-offering into two parts, by a broad red line passing along the front; when the priest stood opposite this line, his right and left would be the north side and the south, though parts of the west side. Thus, one side is three sides; the middle of the west side is west side, and the end of the west side is north side, and the other end is south side! As for the broad red line across the front of the altar of burnt-offering, it seems not to have existed. Some line there was that went all round the altar; but the Jewish sprinkling, even if it had anything to do with the communion table, has been mistaken and misdescribed; and a quotation from Lightfoot, on which all this rests, has been, we regret to state, garbled and changed.‡ Another argument is, that although the Rubric did beyond doubt

---

\* Burnet, 'Reformation,' ii. p. 95.

† 2nd Report, Ritual Commission, p. 407.

‡ 'Mishna,' ed. Surenhusius, v. p. 23.

alter the position of the minister, at the same time that a new place was given to the table, and remove him from the middle of an altar to the north side of a table standing in the chancel or the body of the church; still this cannot be a binding order now, for no table does so stand; but in all cases the altar-like position, against the east wall, has been adopted. The order to stand on the north side has therefore been unmeaning, and may be disobeyed. This view, elaborately argued by Mr. Walton and others, is in conflict with all those opinions that would connect the former altar, and all that belongs to it, with the present table. If the order had reference to a table only, in a table's position and use, all the arguments as to north-west corner and altar of burnt-offering fall at once to the ground. But the answer to it is curiously complete. The copy of the Prayer Book used at the revision of 1662 has been lately found, and beautifully reproduced by photography. In the beginning of it is a sheet of changes proposed to be introduced; it seems to be in the handwriting of Bishop Nicholson. One of these alterations affects the Rubric under discussion; for 'side,' it was proposed to read 'part.' Turning to the place in the book itself, we find 'part' inserted, but afterwards erased: the alteration had been proposed, considered, and rejected. But unless the altar-like position of the table had been in view, there would have been no meaning in such a discussion. Those whom we have spoken of, as placing the 'north part' on the west side of the table, but towards the north, would naturally wish that 'part' might be read for 'side;' it would make the difference between facing east and facing south, which was what they desired. But if the table were placed lengthwise in the chancel, the dispute was idle; no one has ever suggested that the northern part of the west end of a table so situated was the place to stand. No doubt it is remarkable that, just at the Restoration, when the churches had been in Puritan hands so long, it should be assumed that the altarwise position would prevail. But the fact is so; and the significance of it cannot be mistaken. One objection more: it is added that the priest cannot stand at the north side in our present churches, because it is an end and not a side that forms the north. This needs no elaborate answer. 'Euclid's definition of a parallelogram as a four-sided figure should be amended if this be true, and also the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, which has 'the presbyter standing at the north side or end thereof.' The controversy between Williams and Heylin began with a direction of Bishop Williams to the Vicar of Grantham. 'This table, without some new cause, is not to stand altarwise and you at the north end thereof,

thereof, but tablewise, and you must officiate on the north side of the same by the Liturgy.' And throughout the dispute it was assumed that whatever the position of the table, the vicar must stand on the north of it, side or end.\*

All this loose writing is rendered vain by two or three facts as indisputable as any historical materials can be; that in 1550, Edward VI. and his council ordered, 'that with all diligence, all the altars be taken down, and instead of them a table be set up; † that the Rubric of 1552 referred to this table and not to the altar; and that in 1662, at the last revision, the priest was directed to stand at the north side, and not at the north part.

Still there is the second Rubric to interpret. Before the prayer of consecration some change seems to be prescribed: 'When the priest standing before the table hath so ordered the bread and wine . . . he shall say,' &c. Is this a permission to leave the north side? Is the priest to return immediately? Or is he to remain till the end of the consecration prayer in his new position? Or even to the end of the service?

Now this second Rubric was first introduced in 1661-2; the Rubric corresponding to it in 1604 was simply 'the priest standing up;' and as this did not order a change of position, it did not permit one, for 'no addition is permitted.' A party in the Church had desired some change, and Laud and Wren had made occasion of the apparent inconvenience of the existing Rubric to suggest a relaxation of the direction, so that the priest might have more convenient access to the elements. The Rubric in question was new in 1661, new in substance as well as in form. The corresponding Rubric of 1604 was simply 'the priest standing up, shall say.' In the one there was some change of position with reference to the table, in the other no change, except that of posture from kneeling to standing. For the first time since the reign of Edward VI., some change at least was ordered, some relaxation allowed from the direction to stand at the north side. And the matter was not one to which people had ever become indifferent. A minister with his back to the people would have always been thought to have his face set towards Rome. Laud was charged with a similar change in the Scottish Liturgy, and he is most anxious that a right interpretation should be given. It was for the sake of allowing the priest freer use of his hands, answers Laud, 'and I protest, in the presence of Almighty God, I know of no other intention therein than this.' Wren had actually consecrated with his back to the people; he too is anxious not to be misunderstood: 'being low

---

\* Rev. O. J. Elliott, 'North Side of Table,' pp. 34, 35.

† Cardwell, 'Documentary Annals,' i. p. 89.



of stature he could not reach over his book if he stood on the north side ;' an answer which, by the way, implies that the north was the prescribed side.

An alteration, then, of the priest's position in consecrating was not a thing that could escape attention in 1661. It had never been discussed or acted without raising alarm. If the alteration actually made be only a permission to leave, for a time, the position in the north to order the bread and wine for convenient access, then there is no more reason for alarm than there is in the priest's walking to the rails to distribute the elements ; but if a permission is given to turn away from the congregation altogether for the prayer of consecration and, perhaps, for all the service after it, then there is a change with a meaning, and one which, to say the least, some one or other would have been indignant about.

The silence is so general as to prove that no one suspected that this Rubric had let in the eastward position.

The Puritan party at the Savoy Conference knew nothing of it. They puzzled over the careless answer of the Bishops to another objection, which seemed to imply that priest and people were to turn their backs upon each other in prayer. Of this greater change they say nothing.

'The minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks of them, as in lessons, absolutions, and benedictions, it is convenient that he turns to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit they should all turn another way.' The ministers answer ; 'What you may mean by *they* all we know not.\*

Again the Rubric is not optional in form ; it is a positive order. Before it, before 1661, the minister was to stand according to the normal position ; after it he must stand 'before the table,' from the beginning of the consecration service. Between the adoption of the 'north side Rubric,' Bishops, at their visitations, were always inquiring how it was observed. Ridley, Hooper, Parkhurst, ask whether there is any 'shifting of the book,' that is, any change of position from north to west, during the celebration. Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Cosin, asks if the minister stands at the north side, and performs all things there, save when he had cause to remove from it ; but the saying the consecration prayer is not one of the occasions for removing.† If, then, the order made in 1661 is a different order, reversing this practice, we ought to find the Bishops and others inquiring

---

\* 'Documents on Act of Uniformity,' pp. 165, 313.

† Brooke, 'Privy Council Judgments,' p. 198 (*Purchas' Case*).

after its observance: there is no such thing to be found. Add to this important negative testimony the positive witness of all the principal writers on the subject, as to what was the practice about and after 1661, and the argument seems very conclusive. L'Estrange, in 1659, two years before this Rubric, says of the practice of standing at the north side, 'this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest's standing with his face towards the east, as is the Popish practice.\*' Nicholls, in 1710, in his 'Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer,' after describing the Popish practice, says:

'But our Church enjoins the direct contrary, and that for a direct contrary reason. He is to stand before the table indeed just so long as he is ordering the bread and wine; but after that he is to go to some place where he may break the bread *before the people*, which must be the north side, there being in our present Rubric no other place mentioned for performing any part of this sacrament. But to say the Consecration Prayer (in the recital of which the bread is broken) standing before the table is not to break the bread before the people, for then the people cannot have a view thereof, which our wise reformers, upon very good reasons, ordered they should.'

Bennet, writing on the Common Prayer in 1708, writes:

'If the table be close to the east wall the minister stands on the north side and looks southward, and then turning to the westward he looks full towards all the people.'

Wheatley, in his well-known work, published in 1710, explains:

'Whereas it stands the priest is obliged to stand at the north side of it, which seems to be enjoined for no other end but to avoid the practice of the Romish Church, where the priest stands before the table with his face towards the east.'

These passages are unintelligible on the supposition that in 1661 the order was altered, and the priest was allowed to go through the most solemn part of the service, precisely in that position which had been described as Popish, and against which such objections could be brought.

We cannot pursue the subject. Minute as the point is, it has a literature of its own. The tracts of Mr. Ross, Mr. Droop, and others, have collected nearly all that could be said; but a whole number of the 'Quarterly' would be required to develop it. But there are two conclusions that must be drawn from the facts. One is, that from the Second Book of Edward VI. down to the Book of Charles II., the north side was the normal position of the

---

\* 'Alliance of Divine Offices,' p. 245.

minister, and that north side meant north end when the table was at the east wall. The evidence for this seems crying and irresistible. The other is, that no general change of order was understood to take place in this respect from 1661 onwards, and that the silence of objectors, and the comments of interpreters, show very clearly what the practice was during the next hundred years; a practice which prevailed almost universally down to the year 1840, or thereabouts: which was, in the words of the 'Non-Jurors' Liturgy' of 1718, that 'whenever the priest is directed to turn to the altar, or to stand or kneel before it, or with his face towards it, it is always meant that he should stand or kneel on the north side thereof;' this side being explained in a later edition as the same as 'north end.'

The judgment of the Privy Council virtually affirmed these propositions. It is important to observe that if they had decided otherwise, they would have reversed the practice of three centuries.

It is true that there is an apparent contradiction between two judgments of that learned body on this point. The Lord Chancellor, departing from the usual practice of refusing to discuss in Parliament judicial decisions which may again be the subject of review, admitted, in the debate on the Public Worship Bill, the existence of such a difficulty, and may be said even to have exaggerated it in the zeal of debate. Perhaps it may be regretted that the words in which the posture of standing was insisted on in the Mackonochie case were not more guarded. 'They [the Lords forming the Court] think the words "standing before the table" apply to the whole sentence.' This interpretation is inconsistent with the practice and the comments to which we have alluded; and it was not at all required for the general course of the judgment, which was, that in a service so carefully constructed and revised, a great change of posture, from standing to kneeling, importing adoration, could not be allowed to take place in the midst of a prayer without some special direction. But if the matter comes under review, as it probably will, any court must decide upon the formularies as interpreted by history; it must not, because there is an appearance of contradiction between two judgments, dismiss the question as one that cannot be solved. In few points is the intention of the Church, from the Reformation downwards, plainer than in this. The Lord Chancellor recommended the House to make it a thing indifferent by legislation, and the House shrank from the task; but it was within the competence of Parliament to do so: it is not within the competence of a court.

A large

A large party is asking at this moment whether this concession cannot be made to them. The answer is not easy. A point so trifling in itself it would seem to be very severe and intolerant not to concede. It is trifling, replies the layman, but you have made so much of it. Seven thousand clergymen have passed a censure on the judgment of a court, which, perhaps, not seven hundred of them had read, and upon which, perhaps, not seventy were qualified by their reading to pass an opinion. Whence all this stir? Mr. Walton would use the 'mid-altar position,' in order to be

'in harmony with the better mind and ascertained principles of our own Church in preceding centuries, and in harmony too and outward conformity with the prevailing usage of Catholic Christendom.\*'

These are no trifling results. The Union Jack is but a rag of hunting, but when it is made a symbol of the power and might of England, it is no more a rag, but a national emblem. If the mid-altar position is to carry the Church back to the centuries preceding the Reformation and to conform it to the existing Churches of the Romish communion, then the trifling gesture and the important intention will have to be considered together. No one would grudge a modern Bishop Wren of diminutive stature the leave to stand where he could reach over the book. No one would prevent a Laud from having the use of his hands, if that were all. Such pleas are not now put forward.

'We have to make confession the ordinary custom of the masses, and to teach them to use Eucharistic worship. We have to establish our claims to catholic ritual in its highest form. We have to restore the Religious Life, to say mass daily, and to practise reservation for the sick.†'

The reader can judge for himself what is the temper and disposition of the country at this moment towards Romanism, and what is the probability that the movement will be facilitated by the nation granting leave to take the first steps. If this particular change were conceded, would it not be accompanied by other explanations and limitations, which would show that it was not the mind of Church or people of England to change the laws of the Church, in order to conform them again to the superstitions from which she had long escaped?

It would occupy too much space to discuss at length the use of 'the sacrificial vestments' as they are called. Like the eastward position, they have given occasion to a very learned discussion; like that, they are things indifferent in themselves, but

---

\* 'Celebrant's Position,' p. 44.

† Rev. O. Shipley, 'Four Cardinal Virtues,'  
are

are sought on one side and feared on the other, as part of what is magniloquently called 'the great catholic revival.' The right to wear them is insisted on in the 'declaration' quoted above, and already counter-declarations protesting against them are beginning to rustle in the air.

There have been, it seems, two kinds of dress for the clergy of the Church of England. One of these consists of chasuble, alb, and tunicle, and is supposed to imply a sacrificial ministry in the wearer; the other consists of surplice and (in cathedrals on great occasions) cope. The chasuble is often called the 'vestment,' as in the Rubric of the Prayer Book of 1549, the first book of Edward VI. In that book the name of 'mass' is preserved, and the use of the 'vestment' permitted. In the second Prayer Book the sacrificial vestments were forbidden. Seven years later came the book of Elizabeth, which seemed to bring back the vestments, as in the former book of Edward VI. It appears, however,\* that the intention was not to revive the use of the vestments, but to keep them together in the churches, until they could be dealt with advisedly. The Injunctions issued in the same year, ordered inventories to be taken of all the vestments and ornaments of worship that belonged to the altar and the mass; then came the Advertisements of Elizabeth, in 1564, forbidding the use of the vestments, and prescribing instead 'a comely surplice with sleeves.' A great mass of testimony proves that before the scathing breath of these Advertisements the 'vestments' withered away and disappeared, save where an occasional alb or two were preserved, as materials for new surplices. In a few years they were gone. Discussions took place as to whether these Advertisements had the Queen's sanction; but they were acted on as if they had received it; and in 1603-4 the canons expressly recognised their validity. The course adopted by the revisers of the Prayer Book in 1603-4 seems somewhat inconsistent. They left the ornaments-rubric as it stood in Queen Elizabeth's book; but the canons which sanctioned the use of this Prayer Book provided that the surplice should be in use, and did not order or recognise the vestments.† The two, however, were read together, for there was no attempt whatever to bring back the vestments between 1604 and 1661. It was a hard matter sometimes to get the surplice itself worn. Then comes the present Prayer Book and its Rubric, differing in several particulars from the former one, yet following the language both of the Rubric and of the statute of Elizabeth.

---

\* Archbishop Sandys, in Brooke, *Privy Council Judgments*, p. 169 (*Purchas' Case*).

† See 'English Church Furniture,' by E. Peacock, 1866.

It had run, 'the minister at the time of the communion and at all other times in his ministration should use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament,' &c. It now becomes 'such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration should be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by authority of Parliament,' &c. The changes are slight in appearance, but significant. They show\* that the Rubric was reconsidered, and we know that objections had been taken to it. They do away with the distinction between different ministrations as needless, now that the surplice was the one garb of the minister. And they insert from the Act the word 'retained,' the revisers being well aware that the vestments had disappeared for the best part of a century, so that, in order to restore them, the word 'retained' would have had no force. The canons of 1603-4 continued to be binding, and these showed that the surplice was to be worn.\* The vestments were then restored under this amended Rubric. It is a positive order, if it is anything. It is not permissive merely; yet the Bishops in their visitation articles are always asking if the surplice is used in all ministrations; suggesting, in other words, a breach of the law, on the supposition that the new Rubric brought back the vestments.

The Privy Council have drawn out with elaboration in the Purchas judgment the facts which we have hastily sketched. And now that criticism has had its say upon that decision, the laity may ask themselves what would have been the result of an opposite judgment? To 'retain' would have meant to 'restore' things abolished two centuries ago, the very form of which had been forgotten. Nothing was more remarkable than the want of information shown before the Ritual Commission by the leaders of the 'Catholic Revival' as to the 'minutiae of Rubrics,' and the origin of the very changes they were making. The gaudy dress with which some have lately astonished or distressed their congregations in holy communion, would have become of universal obligation under an express Rubric. And the Church would have confessed, Queen, Bishops, Priests, and Laymen, that from 1559 to 1871 the Church had\* made a complete mistake as to the legal mode of celebrating its chief rite! If law and history had proved this, the strain upon common sense would have been severe; happily law, history, and common sense had the same tale to tell, and the vestments not being 'retained' must be deliberately 'restored' by the Legislature, if they are to be used.

---

\* Canon 58.

Here, then, is a short summary of the principles which seem to have guided the Privy Council in matters of ritual. The Prayer Book is to be regarded as the complete and sufficient guide of worship, and no one is to add thereto. The things removed from worship in the time of Edward VI. and Elizabeth were lawfully removed then, and have not since been restored by any law.

If doctrinal cases are included in the survey, it will appear that the Judicial Committee have had cases before them affecting every one of the three great parties in the Church. "They have shown themselves somewhat slow to convict for errors of doctrine on any side. In the cases of Mr. Williams, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Heath, and Mr. Voysey, the latitude to be allowed in interpreting the Articles and formularies was fully discussed. Mr. Heath and Mr. Voysey were condemned: it is difficult to conceive any system of interpretation under which they could have escaped, short of the right to affirm as true, and then to deny, the same proposition. The other defendants were acquitted, and there was a decided tendency shown in the judgment upon them to afford them all benefit from possible interpretations of their words. But in a penal case any court would think the defendant entitled to this. In the Gorham case (which, by the way, was not a case under the Clergy Discipline Act) the interests of the 'Evangelical party' were thought to be involved. The judgment established their right to a place in the Church of England. In the recent case of *Sheppard v. Bennett* the 'High Church party' threatened secession if Mr. Bennett were condemned from statements which were characterised by the Judgment as 'rash and ill-judged, and perilously near a violation of the law.' Mr. Bennett was not condemned; but, as an editor of these judgments observes,\* 'all that is decided in his favour amounts to no more than this: that the dogmatic statements which he makes, when charitably viewed and taken *in meliori sensu*, are not so plainly repugnant to, or irreconcilable with, the teaching of the Church as to justify the Court in visiting him with punishment.' Throughout this group of cases there has been evinced a disposition to examine with patience and respect the doctrinal standards of the Church, and a marked indisposition to inflict punishment or loss on account of doctrinal expressions. A different course would have resulted in condemnations which would have been taken by each of the great parties in the Church in turn as affecting itself. No doubt each judgment in its turn brought pain and excited comment; nor are we called on to

---

\* Brooke, 'Privy Council Judgments,' p. 272.

defend or discuss the decisions. But the general course of them does not seem to be repugnant to the principles of English justice; nor can it be said that it tends to the protection of any one party or the extirpation of any other.

Under the Judicature Act of 1872 the court is now reconstituted. The recasting of all the machinery of jurisprudence through the country gave the occasion, which those who afterwards opposed the Public Worship Bill were not slow to seize, and for the future all those cases will come before a purely secular tribunal. Convocation, taken by surprise perhaps, made no sign. But a great and fruitful change has been effected—with what results it may be difficult now to presage. It is certain that the Ritualistic party have again and again protested against the present Judicial Committee as a secular tribunal, having no right to decide in spiritual causes. Will they obey the new secular tribunal for which they have successfully agitated? If not, will the nation consent again to alter its highest tribunal because an active party finds its decisions do not help them to ‘a harmony and outward conformity with the prevailing usage of Catholic Christendom’?

The condition of things in the Church had become such as to fill the boldest with astonishment and the bravest with alarm. The Ritualistic party asserted their right to disobey alike the admonitions of the Bishops and the decisions of the Courts in favour of ‘the voice of the Catholic Church.’\* The voice of the Catholic Church, being interpreted by each clergyman for himself, is equivalent to the fancy of each clergyman; and what was openly claimed was ‘protection from interference’ for any clergyman in doing his own will, and speaking according to his own fancy, in the parish where he ministered. The discipline that was to deal with this lawlessness was vested in courts which, for slowness and for cost, might break the spirit and ruin the purse of any one who attempted to put them in motion. In the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie* the costs were about 5000*l.*; and one scandalous fact connected with that case was elicited in the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, that when Mr. Mackonochie had been duly sentenced and the prosecutor had to come back to the court to enforce obedience, the costs for a monition to enforce obedience amounted to 145*9*/. The offences charged were laid in 1866, and it was not till 1870, or four years after, that the last order was made.† It was a sentence of three months’ suspension from duty upon one who had been twice before the court for setting its monition at defiance. Litigation being

\* See for illustrations a work called ‘Facts and Testimonies touching Ritualism,’ by Oxoniensis. 1874.

† ‘Times,’ May 12, 1874.



too expensive for private purses and too long for the ordinary life of man, passed into the hands of two Limited Liability Companies: the Church Union offered to prosecute Mr. Voysey and to defend in the Ritualist cases; the Church Association had for its object to proceed against the Ritualists. Fees, such as counsel dreamed not of before, were paid from the stock thus raised. An attempt by the Bishop of London to enforce the law in all the cases in his diocese, the most important, might have absorbed the whole revenues of the see for five years. In short, the old order of a Church governed by an episcopate was fast returning to primeval chaos, and those were the dissolvent principle who professed in theory the greatest reverence to catholic order. A Church or a State can subsist through troubles and even errors; but an organisation without laws is a contradiction in terms, and what would be mere anarchy in a State cannot *à fortiori* have place in the Church of God, who 'is not the Author of confusion but of peace.' The question was no longer whether this or that practice should prevail, but whether any clergyman, who had vowed to his Ordinary a reverent obedience, and had solemnly declared his approval of and adherence to the Prayer Book, might manipulate the Prayer Book to suit his own fancy, and defy and lampoon his Bishop upon the slightest remonstrance.

Whence was to come the remedy? Both Convocations had pronounced their opinion; it was hostile to the pretensions of the Ritualists. Perhaps the Duke of Marlborough was in theory right when he said that any measure for reforming the Church courts should be a Government measure; but no Government was likely to undertake so thankless a task. The laity had gone on complaining for twenty-two years. In April, 1851, the Queen sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury an address to the Crown, signed by 230,000 persons, against innovations in public worship. On the 5th of May, 1873, an address was presented to the two Archbishops at Lambeth, drawing attention to the magnitude of the evil and suggesting remedies. It was signed by more than 60,000 persons of weight and influence. The Archbishops took some time to consider their reply, and in it they admitted the existence of the evil. The admission has been echoed from every side in the recent debates in Parliament, even by those who were most opposed to legislation. The reply of the Archbishops was probably the origin of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, which was an attempt on the part of the Bishops themselves to remove a wrong and a danger admitted on all hands to exist.

The attempt to legislate produced, as might be expected, a storm

storm of invective. All the fountains of abuse in that strange portion of the press, the Ritualistic papers, poured forth their black streams anew. Nobody seemed to study the measure itself; every one viewed it through some distorting lens. What was less to be expected and more to be deplored was, that the High Church party, who would not come under the scope of the measure at all, joined their voices with the rest in indignant protest against legislation. They, too, refused to view the measure in its real nature. But the time has now come for describing it as it really is.

What with the changes forced upon the measure by various parties, it may be said that there were three Bills for the regulation of public worship. They were all alike in these points: the right to complain was strictly limited to those who might have an interest; the offences were also specified and limited with care to changes in the fabric and ritual of the churches; and contumacious disobedience to the orders of the tribunal was to be followed by suspension.

In the Bill originally proposed the idea was to give to the Bishop that directory power as to worship which the Prayer Book and the Canons seem to have contemplated, in more than one place where matters are to be decided by reference to the Bishop. But there was to be associated with him a board of assessors, clerical and lay, belonging to the diocese, whose advice and determination would guide him. An appeal was to be allowed to the incumbent from the Bishop and his assessor to the Archbishop with an assessor, whose decision would be final. The objections to such a proposal are obvious. It was a new kind of tribunal, and it involved elections of assessors and the consequent excitements. The mode in which an untried body would do its work was matter of conjecture. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that this measure was an attempt to get rid of judicial mechanism, and to refer complaints less formally to a Bishop sitting in his chamber with advisers round him. It soon became evident, however, that this novel proposal would meet no support from those without whose legal knowledge and official position no proposal coming from the Bishops could have been expected to be adopted by Parliament.

Hence it came that, on the second reading, a number of amendments were announced that virtually made the measure a new one, and the second Bill came into existence. Complaints were to come from the same quarters, and were to relate to the same things, as in the first draft, but the hearing was to be before the Bishop and his Chancellor, or, if the Chancellor were not a lawyer, then before an assessor in lieu of the Chancellor.

The

The Bishop might refuse to proceed in the case; but then the complainant might appeal to the Archbishop, who might adjudicate. If the case was heard before the Bishop, then either party might appeal to the Archbishop; but the Archbishop might then send the case at once to the Privy Council without retaining it for hearing in his own court; by which much time and expense would be saved.

But this amended Bill was to give place to a third Bill. As the day for the committee approached, a mass of amendments accumulated, probably unexampled in amount. Out of them, however, emerged three of chief importance. Lord Shaftesbury proposed that one ecclesiastical judge should preside in the courts of Canterbury and of York, with a salary of 4000*l.* a year, to be raised ultimately out of the fees on marriage licences, and other like payments, but in the meantime by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. All cases of complaint under the Act were to go direct to this judge; and, an appeal lay from him to the Supreme Court of Appeal. The appointment of the judge would be in the two Archbishops, with the approval of the Crown. Some amusement was afforded by the Bishop of Peterborough on the second reading, who pointed out that Lord Shaftesbury had been denouncing several principles that had been adopted from his own Bill of 1872 into the Archbishops' Bill; but the probable solution was that the amendments which now stood in his name had been drawn for him by another hand, and that he had not considered their bearing upon his own legislative efforts on the same subject.

The objection to these schemes—to the Archbishops' and Lord Shaftesbury's alike—to the minds of many Churchmen besides Lord Selborne, was the inevitable air of litigation which it introduced. The authority of the Bishop himself seemed likely to be merged for ever in that of his court. There had been enough of law and of courts; could not the office of a Bishop be restored, with its attributes of counsel in all things and decision in cases of doubt? Was it worth while to enact that for the future there should be two courts and not three, and good rules of procedure, instead of those which had proved bad and antiquated? Might not some nobler mode of treatment of such subjects yet be found? Lord Selborne endeavoured to answer that question in some amendments, which, if they had been introduced at first as a substantive measure, would have received, as they certainly deserved, a fuller consideration. The Bishop was to have power to issue a monition on any subject dealt with by this Act with or without complaint, addressed to the incumbent, directing him what to do or to discontinue. The incumbent had only

two

two courses open; he must either obey, or must return for answer that he believed the monition to order things 'unauthorised by law.' Thereupon the Bishop would take steps to obtain a legal decision by application to the Archbishop, who might, as in a former draft, send the case direct to the Court of Final Appeal. But that court would have before it simply the monition of the Bishop and the objections of the incumbent, and would determine in a summary manner, and as a matter of urgency, whether the monition was legal or not. There would be no provision as to costs. This plan would be distasteful to those who wished to use the law courts for fighting inch by inch the ground of Ritualism; but to all others it would offer several advantages. It would bring back to a reality the visitatorial power of the Bishop, and his power as referee in the doubtful cases mentioned in the Preface to the Prayer Book; nor would it have carried that power much higher than it had stood in former times. But, besides this, it would have been a real and complete remedy for all the evils complained of; and no one can promise so much for the Act that has at last been passed. The Bishop's monition would be valid in all cases where it was good in law. A few more decisions upon disputed points would have made the body of the law complete: if in one or two cases the Court of Final Appeal had modified its judgments, these reconsidered opinions would guide the law. That the remedy would have been very complete, and far less expensive than any other, may safely be said. But there were objections which could not have been got over. The Bishops did not seek a power which would seem to make them immediately responsible for every change in every parish, and to reduce to the position of curates to the Bishop all the incumbents of the diocese. The laity had become sore and angry with the Bishops at the long delay of the remedy which they sought. The Government would probably have lent no help to the proposal. It is even possible that a leading member of the Cabinet regarded Lord Shaftesbury's amendments, which moved upon another line, with something of parental regard. From all these causes it happened that the plan of Lord Selborne hardly received the full and attentive consideration which the position of the author and the merits of the scheme itself would have commanded at another time.

The only other amendment that need be discussed as fundamental was that brought forward by the Bishop of Peterborough. It provided that certain things were exempt from proceedings under this Act, on the ground that doubts were entertained about them, and 'it is not desirable that the clergy and laity should

should be disquieted by litigation about any such matters ;' a remark applicable, we should hope, to all matters. The class of *adiaphora* thus created contained seven heads :—1. The 'North Side' question ; 2. The use of the words of administration to each communicant separately ; 3. The use of hymns in worship ; 4. Evening communions ; 5. The preaching of afternoon or evening sermons ; 6. The compulsory use of daily public prayer ; and 7. The use of the Communion Service. To these it was immediately proposed by Earl Stanhope to add 'the use of the Athanasian Creed.' It is now understood that this amendment was not conceived by the Bishop of Peterborough ; nor could it have escaped a Bishop that there is no law against afternoon sermons at present, but, on the contrary, a stringent provision for enforcing them, and that the sermon as a distinct service, and the severance of holy communion from the morning service, have been already legalised ; and that if hymns in the service are illegal, the way to deal with a custom absolutely universal is to make it legal as soon as possible, and not to offer a mere exemption from proceedings. When the amendment was stripped of these superfluities, it appeared to offer to the 'Low Church party' the power to disuse the Communion Service in return for the power to the 'High Church' clergyman to stand on the north side. But this proposal was viewed with swift-growing disfavour by almost all parties. It was seen that this original list of exceptions was delusive ; that far more things would be added, or at least striven for ; and no party was disposed to barter important principles for leave to carry out its own principles more fully. If the Athanasian Creed were to be included none would be content with that mode of dealing with a symbol so venerable and so valuable,—the exempting people from prosecution who neglected its use. If the list of exceptions became very large, the principle of uniformity would be abandoned, and the list itself reduced to an absurdity. Other reasons may have come in. But, at all events, when the Bill went into committee that amendment was withdrawn by its proposer, and its details were not discussed at all.

It is well known that the amendments to which Lord Shaftesbury's name were attached were incorporated in the Bill, and gave colour to the measure which passed the Legislature with such unexampled strength of support. Much has been said as to the Bishops allowing their measure to be so materially altered so as to become a new Bill, without withdrawing it and leaving the matter in the hands of the Government. It should be remembered, however, whatever be the view taken at last upon that point, that the Bishops could not possibly carry a measure without the

the aid of one or other of the great parties in Parliament, and that as soon as it became evident that Lord Shaftesbury's amendments would receive a modified but substantial support from several members of the Government, the chief question, would be whether with these a moderate working measure would be produced. If the Government would not initiate a measure, and the Bishops could not pass one, there was no practicable way but that the Bishops should introduce a measure and allow amendments to be proposed to it. So far the course taken was reasonable, and it is well that the Bishops did not stand upon their dignity and demand that Parliament should either adopt or reject the whole measure. The subject was far too difficult, the mind of the country in far too excited a condition, for that high-handed treatment. But it is not explained how this revising process was submitted to twice over. On the second reading large and substantial amendments were announced by the Archbishop of York; and it might have been supposed that these represented the opinion of persons who were found to be disposed to support the measure. It was after this stage that the measure which the leading Lords in the Cabinet were prepared to support took its shape, and in the hostile hand of Lord Shaftesbury. The explanation is to be sought perhaps in the divided condition of the Cabinet itself on this question. The practical result was that the Bishops suffered, but the measure was saved. Lord Shaftesbury, whose soul was vexed by the fate of his own manifold Church Discipline Bills in former sessions, was appeased by being made the instrument of compelling the Archbishop to accept his amendments. The measure thus received a shape in which it was possible for most of the Ministers to support it, without the Government assuming the responsibility at that stage. It is not necessary to decide whether the Bishops should have stood upon their dignity and should have clung to their original measure, or to that modified Bill which they had framed to meet the real or supposed wishes of the Government: one thing is certain, that if they had done so no measure would have been passed in the last session, and it is doubtful whether, with increasing confusion in the Church, the opportunity would ever have returned of passing a moderate Act.

Parliament was not long in expressing its opinion. The second reading in the House of Lords was adopted without a division. When the Bill went into committee the strength of support for it was yet more manifest. The first important division showed a majority of four to one; and in a later clause, giving power to the Bishop to hear and decide in private by

consent, when the Government and the Opposition seemed to combine to reject a part of Lord Shaftesbury's scheme, which was thought an essential qualification of the whole, the united leaders carried into the lobby only 49, whilst the Archbishop of Canterbury was supported by 93. By this time the fate of the measure in the Lords was decided, and the ultra-sacerdotal party had begun to rely on 'pressure to be brought to bear upon members of the House of Commons.'

Pressure of one kind there existed from the first. The Bill left the House of Lords on the 26th of June. During the month of July, through a road encumbered with lagging Bills, amongst which the ablest charioteer might find the measure he was guiding clogged and overthrown, an independent member of the House undertook the task of directing to a successful issue a Bill that must excite at every step as it passed along passions and animosities of every kind, a Bill that would find its wheels spoked with 'amendments' intended to be fatal. From far-off Wales came a breath of rumour that did not presage peace. Achilles was returning to the fray, with the flame upon his head, and that voice the very sound of which carried fear and confusion to Trojan hearts.\* In more sordid prose, Mr. Gladstone rose from nursing his heart upon the War of Troy, and from trimming the quiet woods of Hawarden, and with resolution in his heart and Six Resolutions in his pocket, was to cast himself in the path of this hated measure and to destroy it. So thus, without other pressure, the mere pressure of time seemed to fight against the measure. Upon the whole the prospect of the Public Worship Regulations Bill seemed very poor at the close of the first night's debate upon the second reading. Mr. Gladstone's speech was passionate and vehement from first to last, and promised opposition at every point. A prominent member of the late Government went away from the House and made known to his friends at dinner that Mr. Gladstone had just delivered a most statesmanlike speech, introducing six remarkable resolutions, and that the fate of the Bill was sealed. 'When Mr. Gladstone sat down,' says a writer in the 'Guardian' newspaper, 'every one felt that the Bill had received a fatal blow, and that "not all the King's horses nor all the King's men could put Humpty Dumpty on the wall again," unless, indeed, the Government gave it exceptional advantages.' The actual event, the fate of these resolutions, no writer in the press nor critic in the clubs succeeded in divining. Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen and Mr.

---

\* *Iliad*, xviii., line 208, &c.

Gladstone undertook that the ground should be contested inch by inch; and the speech of the latter showed that his powers for such a task were at their best. Never, according to the unanimous opinion of all who heard him, did the great orator of the House of Commons speak with more brilliancy or greater effect.

Mr. Gladstone's resolutions, containing a distinct policy, should be recorded here:—

‘1. That in proceeding to consider the provisions of the Bill for the Regulation of Public Worship, this House cannot do otherwise than take into view the lapse of more than two centuries since the enactment of the present rubrics of the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England; the multitude of particulars embraced in the conduct of divine service under their provisions; the doubts occasionally attaching to their interpretation, and the number of points they are thought to leave undecided; the diversities of local custom which under these circumstances have long prevailed; and the unreasonableness of prescribing all varieties of opinion and usage among the many thousands of congregations of the Church distributed throughout the land.’

‘2. That this House is therefore reluctant to place in the hands of every single Bishop, on the motion of one or of three persons, howsoever defined, greatly increased facilities towards procuring an absolute ruling of many points hitherto left open and reasonably allowing of diversity, and thereby towards the establishment of an inflexible rule of uniformity throughout the land, to the prejudice, in matters indifferent, of the liberty now practically existing.’

‘3. That the House willingly acknowledges the great and exemplary devotion of the clergy in general to their sacred calling, but it is not on that account the less disposed to guard against the indiscretion, or thirst for power, or other fault of individuals.’

‘4. That the House is therefore willing to lend its best assistance to any measure recommended by adequate authority, with a view to provide more effectual securities against any neglect of or departure from strict law which may give evidence of a design to alter, without the consent of the nation, the spirit or substance of the established religion.’

‘5. That, in the opinion of the House, it is also to be desired that the members of the Church, having a legitimate interest in her services, should receive ample protection against precipitate and arbitrary changes of established custom by the sole will of the clergyman and against the wishes locally prevalent among them, and that such protection does not appear to be afforded by the provision of the Bill now before the House.’

‘6. That the House attaches a high value to the concurrence of her Majesty's Government with the ecclesiastical authorities in the initiative of legislation affecting the Established Church.’

Now, there can be no doubt that these resolutions are entirely against the whole principle of Acts of Uniformity from the  
2 Q 2  
beginning.



beginning. Sir William Harcourt found an easy triumph in pointing out that, from the Reformation downwards, the having 'one use,' instead of the numerous service-books that had prevailed, had been the purpose of the Church of England, expressed in the preface of all her Prayer Books in succession. There are, of course, objections to this absolute uniformity; and it admits of argument whether the advantages or the disadvantages of uniformity predominate. The Shortened Services Act of 1872 is an admission that in some points relaxation of uniformity may be permitted and is desirable. Further steps may be taken in the same direction; it is likely that they will. But this is not the question here. Shall a clergyman have power to make changes himself in any or all of the services of the Church irrespective of the practice of his predecessor, of the wish of the congregation, and of the ruling of the Bishop? Shall he have no limit upon his power of doing so except that his alterations must not 'give evidence of a design to alter, without the consent of the nation, the spirit or substance of the established religion'? Is such a test at all practical? The reason for an Act of Uniformity is, to recall the language of the judgment in the Bennett case, that 'if the minister be allowed to introduce at his own will variations in the rites and ceremonies that seem to him to interpret the doctrine of the service in a particular direction, the service ceases to be what it was meant to be,—common ground on which all Church people may meet, though they differ about some doctrines.' The parishioner as he goes to church has a right to know, as to all substantial points, what service it is in which he is to engage and to which he is to commit himself by taking his part. No doubt he should have some protection as to the sermon also; but his share in that is different. If it is against his views of doctrine he mentions that fact to his wife and his neighbour on the way home. If it is dull and careless, another kind of remedy steals over him of itself in the course of it. But to see his clergyman bowing to the elements when no such homage is directed, or wearing various garbs that are not ordered, which are so much the more alarming to him by how much the less he understands their origin or meaning; these things irritate and concern him even when he does not know in what quarter to complain. But his clergyman would not admit that these changes are intended 'to alter the spirit and substance of the established religion.' On the contrary, the language held by the Ritualists is always, from Tract 90 downwards, that the formularies of the Church of England, rightly understood, are consistent with medieval doctrine, rightly understood. So that the parishioner has put upon him the onus of proving

proving that the changes are intended to subvert the established religion, in the face of a protest from the clergyman that they will do nothing of that kind. The last times of that parishioner would be worse than the first. For the passing of these Resolutions would have been a complete change in the position of the Church of England. Besides the well-known passage in the Preface to the Prayer Book the whole history of the Rubrics from 1549 to 1662 shows that directions, even distinct ones, in the Prayer Book were held to be strictly binding, and that those who wished them altered sought to do it by law. Even where there were offences, the mode in which they were dealt with proved the principle. Wren did not plead that his eastward position 'was not intended to subvert the religion of the country;' he pleaded that he was a little man. Laud, in like circumstances, advanced no such general plea, but only that he could use his hands better. In modern times, long before this controversy arose, that eminent judge, Sir John Nicholl,\* affirmed the principle of uniformity: 'The law directs that a clergyman is not to diminish in any respect, or to add to, the prescribed form of worship; uniformity in this respect is one of the leading and distinguishing principles of the Church of England; nothing is left to the fancy of the individual. If every minister were to alter, omit, or add according to his own taste, this uniformity would soon be destroyed.' The courts have again and again affirmed this principle in later decisions, and it may now be taken as settled. But in order to meet and arrest a Bill, which made no new law, created no new offence, and only improved the procedure of the Ecclesiastical Courts, the great liberal chief came down from his retreat, prepared not to relax a little the principle of uniformity within definite limits, not to increase the number of things that may be done in one of two ways at discretion; but to abolish the principle of uniformity altogether, in favour of the principle of diversity, with this distinction only, that if it could be proved that the changes were subversive of the national religion some check should then be applicable.

This, however, was not to be. On the 15th of July, after an adjourned debate of unusual power and dignity, Mr. Disraeli, in a speech of great force, disposed of the resolution which laid on the Government the duty of dealing with Church Discipline Bills by an easy reference to the series of Lord Shaftesbury's Bills of past years, to none of which the Government of the day had put its hand. Doing justice to the three great parties

---

\* In *Newberry v. Goodwin*, 1 Phillimore's 'Reports,' p. 282.

in the Church, he denounced the action of those who foster Romish doctrines which when they entered the Church they had taken a solemn promise to reject utterly. He described the debate 'as only part of a great struggle agitating all Europe.

'I speak from strong conviction and from a sense of duty when I say that I wished to direct the public mind as far as I could to the consideration of circumstances in which it was so deeply interested, and which could not fail to influence the history of the country. I said then that it appeared to me to be of the very utmost importance—and I am speaking now of the time when I addressed a large body of my countrymen as lately as autumn last—I said then as I say now, looking to what is occurring in Europe, looking at the great struggle between the temporal and spiritual power which has been precipitated by those changes, of which many in this House are aware that in the disturbances and possible disasters which may await Europe, and which must to a certain extent sympathetically affect England, it would be wise for us to rally on the broad platform of the Reformation, believing as I do that those principles were never so completely and so powerfully represented as by the Church of England, and that without the learning, authority, wealth, and independence of that Church they would by this time have dwindled into nothing.'

Seizing the occasion which Mr. Gladstone had given him, he promised the fullest discussion of the resolutions, and announced that after anxious consideration he thought it best that the question should be settled in the present session.

Eye-witnesses have described what followed. Evening had arrived, and the House, jaded with a long and anxious sitting, was eager to divide. A clear voice made itself heard above the clamour; it was Mr. Hussey Vivian, an old and tried follower of Mr. Gladstone. He rose to warn him not to persevere with his resolutions; 'not twenty men on his own side of the House would follow him into the lobby.' But already deft lieutenants, mournful of aspect, had brought slips of paper to their chief, fraught it seemed with no good tidings. When the Speaker put the question there was no challenge for a division. Amid the roar of mixed cheers and laughter the House broke up; and the six resolutions that seemed to bear in their womb six days of weary fight, melted away into darkness. They were formally withdrawn the next day; and from that time, Mr. Gladstone, yielding not ungracefully to the manifest resolution of the House, abandoned his intention of contesting all the ground, and filled a useful place in the discussion.

From that time the course of the measure was easy; the majorities were overwhelming on all the main details. A conflict seemed at last to impend between the Lords and the Commons

Commons on a subject of very minor importance. A discretion was given by the Bill to each Bishop to allow or to refuse to allow the Act to be put in motion. There is nothing analogous to this in other courts; that an official should have power to close the door of his court against a suitor. The Commons, considering that the matters dealt with under this Act are difficult and delicate, agreed with reluctance to this provision. But they desired to weight it with an appeal to the Archbishop, so that there might be a power of reserving the Bishop's discretion. This had been considered in the Lords, and the Lord Chancellor had there disposed of it, with the words, 'an appeal for discretion is a thing unknown to the law.' The House of Commons reinserted it by a large majority. In the Lords, the Bishop of Winchester, affirming that Bishops are by divine right and that Metropolitans are of human institution, and adding with needless vigour that if he were not sure of his divine commission he would strip off his robes and trample them under his feet, led the opposition to this provision of the Bill. The prelate's argument is difficult to follow. As the law now is, Archbishops are vested with the power of reviewing the discretion of Bishops in many particulars. In Ireland, up to the Disestablishment, the Archbishops could and did inhibit the Bishops whilst they visited their dioceses. In England, as to the sale of glebe lands, the admitting colonial clergy to officiate, the holding of livings in plurality, the celebration of marriages in unusual places, the Bishop cannot act without an Archbishop. Yet these are never construed as restraints on the sacred functions of the Bishop, or on his high commission. All that was proposed here was that if the Bishop's were to have a new power of interposing between a suitor and the justice that he sought, there should be some restraint upon the somewhat hazardous privilege. For less high-flown reasons, however, it was well that the provision should be excluded. It was the inevitable result of past struggles that the relations of Bishops to clergy should be those of law rather than those of pastoral guidance. To grant this appeal would practically have abridged the Bishop's power of mediation very greatly.

Another short debate in the Commons settled the fate of the Bill. Sir William Harcourt inveighed against Mr. Gladstone, but was not suffered to depart unscathed. Mr. Gurney, whose tact and temper had contributed much to the success of the Bill, advised the Commons not to insist on their amendment; the Prime Minister in another speech of vigorous eloquence adopted the same course. The Public Worship Regulation Bill took its place among the completed measures of 1874.

Whilst

Whilst this paper is passing through the press, Mr. Gladstone has published\* his matured view of 'Ritualism.' He defines the word in three senses: as an undue disposition to ritual, as an attempt by means of ritual to assimilate the Church of England to the Church of Rome, and as any changes in ritual which being novel are displeasing to the prejudices of this man and that. Dismissing the last as a mischievous prejudice, he discusses the first, whilst all the rest of the nation has been regarding the second. If, indeed, the question were only, how far ritual might be carried so as to be consistent with the degree of fervour and devotion of which a congregation is capable, Mr. Gladstone would be a useful guide. Here are some remarks which offer matter for thought:—

'To accumulate observances of ritual is to accumulate responsibility. It is the adoption of a higher standard of religious profession; and it requires a higher stand of religious practice. If we study, by appropriate or by rich embellishment, to make the church more like the House of God, and the services in it more impressive by outward signs of His greatness and goodness, and of our littleness and meanness, all these are so many voices, audible and intelligible, though inarticulate, and to let them sound in our ears unheeded is an offence against His majesty. If we are not the better for more ritual we are the worse for it. A general augmentation of ritual, such as we see on every side around us, if it be without any corresponding enhancement of devotion, means more light but no more love.

'But it is even conceivable, nay, far from improbable, that augmentation of ritual may import not increase but even diminution of fervour. Such must be the result in every case where the imagery of the eye and ear, actively multiplied, is allowed to draw off the energy, which ought to have its centre in the heart. There cannot be a doubt that the beauty of the edifice, the furniture, and the service, though their purpose be to carry the mind forward, may induce it to rest upon themselves. Wherever the growth and progress of ritual, though that ritual be in itself suitable and proper, is accepted, whether consciously or unconsciously, and whether in whole or in part, by the individual, as standing in the stead of his own concentration and travail of spirit in devotion, there the ritual, though good in itself, becomes for him so much formality, that is so much deadness.'

But this is a part of an answer to a wrong question: What amount of ritual may precisely suit the English Prayer Book? That is a question which might be settled without much heat, and with which Parliament would not interfere. But the question which has occupied the public mind is a quite different one. When certain clergymen tell us that they hate the

---

\* See 'Contemporary Review' for October, 1874.

Reformation; that the leading Reformers were villains; that the present Prayer Book is inadequate, and that we must at least go back to the first Book of Edward VI., in which Holy Communion was still the Mass; that their object is to revive the doctrine with which the word 'mass' has always been associated, and to establish the system of the confessional in connection with it; when aspirations after a return to medieval practice and doctrine, and to conformity with "the Western church," are freely uttered; in short, when every step taken is a step nearer to Rome, and is openly proclaimed to be a step in that direction; it seems that there is one question, which should take precedence of Mr. Gladstone's:—Which is the Service Book to which our ritual is to be made to conform? That question does not trouble Mr. Gladstone much. It is hopeless, he thinks, to bring the country back to Romanism:—

'At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth; when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith: when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history. I cannot persuade myself to feel alarm as to the final issue of her crusades in England, and this although I do not undervalue her great powers of mischief.'

True; the task is hopeless now as it has been in the past. But in times past it proved impossible, because the nation shook from its neck the imposed or offered yoke. It is no consolation to a parish condemned to bear with the vestments and gestures of Rome, its wafers and mixed chalice, its confessional and its doctrine of transubstantiation, to be told on high authority that the end of such experiments will be that the nation cannot be perverted. They do not wish to suffer the process; they are not disposed to be the body on which the experiment is to be made. To put an end to the experiment itself is the demand of the people, and the task of the legislature and of the government of the Church. Throughout his paper Mr. Gladstone speaks of 'the congregation,' and not of the parishioners, a change not without a wider significance than the limits of this question. Congregations have some power of self-protection: they can cease to gather together. The parishioners, who have all equal shares in the common parish church, have no such protection for their rights. They may reasonably object

object to being used for experiments. Perhaps Mr. Gladstone may hereafter discuss the other question, much more interesting to the people, and on which he could no doubt give a just and sound verdict:—Is it a legitimate use of the pastoral office in the Church of England to endeavour to change her formularies and standards to those of a different Church? That has been the question of the hour, and seems to need the earliest reply. The elaborate paper of Mr. Gladstone condemns such an attempt, but would not hinder it by law: it will probably satisfy no one. The answer of the country, so far, is written in the Act for the Regulation of Public Worship.

It is much to be regretted that some of those who have so loudly condemned this measure have not passed part of their time in reading its provisions. For a measure less like a tool of persecution it would be difficult to conceive. No new offences are created. If a clergyman is supposed to have committed some breach of order, a complainant must first be found, and the Bishop himself cannot be that complainant; so far his hands are tied. The complaint is made. If the clergyman finds that he is wrong and has not a leg to stand on, he can submit at once to the Bishop. If he is confident in his case, he is sent before the new judge of the Ecclesiastical Courts. But that is his fate now, except that he has the possible advantage of being haled before a diocesan Chancellor first. Once in the hands of the new Dean of the Arches he is surrounded with all the safeguards and protections of law, just as at present. Suppose him to be condemned, however, in that court, still he has another resource. The Court of Final Appeal is open to him, and there again all the protection that law can give him is his. The whole process is one step shorter as to time, and it will be one-third cheaper in consequence. We are told that this is the very grievance, that the costs and slowness of the Courts were a protection; but can any party lay claim to a vested right in the dearness and tardiness of justice? If it does, can any country admit such a claim? If it is the right of one side that a cause should last for years and cost five thousand pounds, it is just the wrong of the other side. But now the cause is over and the condemnation pronounced. What is the amount of it? Not suspension or deprivation or pecuniary mulct; but an order not to do the like again. It is only when this order is disobeyed that penal results arise; and in case of prolonged resistance, deprivation would follow at last. It is impossible that this should be otherwise. Every court must have power to enforce its own decrees; and in this class of cases the clergy have formed a special contract with the Church that they will use and obey the Prayer Book.

Book. If they fail in their part of the contract, they cannot expect to hold the position and influence and emoluments that are the other side of it. There are not wanting some who attribute much of the recent troubles to the false leniency shown by the Privy Council to Mr. Mackonochie. But however that may be, the immunity from punishment in contumacious and persistent breaches of the law, is a right that cannot be set up or conceded. One grievance that was made the most of has been that a judgment of the court is to take effect at once, unless it is otherwise ordered by the court. Dr. Pusey exclaims, 'We are to be suspended *pendente lite*,' in a manner to touch the hardest, if it were true; but there is, we repeat, no suspension at all except for disobeying orders or decisions of court; and it is not unreasonable that a clergyman doing a new act or introducing a new garb, should be asked to refrain until he has established completely his legal right. Considering closely the provisions of the Act, the laity will wonder by-and-by what there is so very different from present practice as to cause such effervescence of feeling, and why, if the Bishops were afoot, they did not ask for powers more stringent from a Parliament so willing to grant. The law against new ornaments and against structural changes without a faculty, was just as strict before as it is now. How can the Church be puritanised or reduced to a dead level of uniformity? How can 'the position of every clergyman in the Church be altered,' if the law about ritual remains the same, but with an administration somewhat quickened? Those are not the best friends of the Church of England who use such exaggerated language in the present crisis. There is nothing more remarkable about the Public Worship Regulation Bill than its moderation; and indeed a feeling of disappointment is sure to arise when the working of this measure falls short in thoroughness of the expectations of many who have watched its progress. The promoters were wise to ask for moderate powers; but they must have made their account with that kind of disappointment when they did so.

But it is not the measure itself that pinches, but the resolution to have a measure. In the High Church movement at present there is far less intellectual vigour than there was in its palmy days; and there is a sensitiveness to public opinion in its leaders that suits ill with the violence of their language towards others. They have assumed that all the real work done in the country is their own, and that to suppress Ritualism is to commend and invite laziness. A glance at any large town will show that there is no foundation for this complacent assumption. The Ritualist party has a few successful and active clergymen; and  
also



also a good many of whom this could not be said. It has a small but active following, who, like the supernumeraries at a theatre, create an impression of multitude by entering at many points in divers dresses. They are the same voices that shout at St. James's Hall, respond at St. Alban's, and demonstrate at Church Congresses. The present movement has furnished the first test as to the progress made by the Ritualist party in its ambitious programme of 'obliterating the Reformation and bringing back the nation to the position of past ages and of other nations. They have had unusual advantages, supporters in the present Cabinet and in the last. But when the question was fairly before the House of Commons whether it was not high time to check their proceedings, the answer was unanimous, and their friends were unable even to divide. This is the really important point, far more so than the measure which was produced.

The lesson thus given may yet be wisely received. There can be no disposition on any side to narrow the Church of England. Within her borders have met together Taylor, Bull, Waterland, Barrow, Butler, Leighton, Beveridge, Burnet, Ken, and Tillotson, in generations gone by; and in our own time a Keble, a Trench, a Stanley, a MacNeile, a Robertson have found room for their feet. With a National Church, to narrow is to destroy; but the narrowing begins when any one party tries to trim the Liturgy for its exclusive use. If vestments and genuflections and attitudes of mystery are required as essential then strife begins, and intolerance and exclusion. The three great parties that have existed in the Church will still exist, and each will contribute its share to the common life. For the motto of the Church of England might well be 'evangelical truth and apostolic order'; and her attitude towards the culture and science of the world, one of friendly but independent interest; and the High Churchman, the Evangelical and the Broad Churchman, each finds in this programme the point that he would make prominent. The Church has done and is doing a great work; hers is not a life that can be snuffed out by a Church Discipline Bill. If there should be restored to her by means of this act the grace of obedience and order, it will reinforce her with new strength to deal with problems that require all the powers spiritual, moral, and intellectual that she can put forth.

For this is no question of a few wilful priests and disorderly churches. Far greater interests are at stake. The Church of England occupies at this moment a position of deep importance to the whole modern world. Mr. Disraeli, almost alone of the  
speakers

speakers in the late debate, lifted the discussion to that higher level, and warned his hearers of the coming struggle. We are engaged in it already. On the one side, Popery severing itself more and more from all modern interests, and exercising less and less influence over them, has stretched to the utmost the measure of her pretensions. The ideas of the world and of the Papacy are two streams proceeding in opposite directions. To welcome culture and civilisation, and to trust the masses of the people gradually with higher and higher privileges, these are the aims of all parties in the modern world; and the Conservative shares them as well as the Liberal. And these are no worldly impulses in the bad sense of that word: freedom and education and independence are of the spiritual part of us; they ennoble him that receives them and him that confers. The Pope replies to these ideas, to this tendency, with a Syllabus and a Dogma of Infallibility. To curse the knowledge which it cannot control, and to strive more and more towards absolute irresponsible power, are the tendencies of the great spiritual guide of millions in Europe. What is the consequence? Search the literature of every Roman Catholic country, and you see how little influence of any kind the dominant religion possesses. The thought of the world has passed out of its hands: it has no sympathy with it: it is moving in an opposite direction. The Papacy has begun by anathematizing and casting out all modern thought and science; how then can it hope to influence them? Intellectually the Pope is passing fast into the position of Benedict XIII., when the Council of Constance had deposed him, and he was shut up with a handful of followers: 'The whole Church is assembled in Peniscola, not in Constance, as once the whole human race was shut up in Noah's Ark.' This is the guide whom millions have inherited as their one authority in spiritual things; this is the power with which many desire to be in communion; this is the Church that makes proselytes in this country. No doubt an infallible guide in spiritual things would be better than our troubles, only three things stand in the way: this claim to infallible rule and supremacy is a violation of the old constitution of the Church, a contradiction of all the history of the Papacy, and a blasphemy against the Almighty.

Contrast with this the Syllabus of Prof. Tyndall at Belfast, and you have the other great force at work upon modern thought fully before you, and described in eloquent language. It is, however, materialism of the most thorough-going kind. Before it, should it prevail, prayer and faith in God, and fear of God, must go down; and all the churches that teach these must dissolve. It has already prevailed much; in Germany and France its power is

is great, and spreads widely. It is at the bottom of many social troubles that have befallen other countries; and, perhaps, this country is not safe. We are not to suppose that science confines itself to its own work of observation and classification of facts; it has become in its turn dogmatic. 'Though in the course of ages,' says Mr. Maxwell, 'catastrophes have occurred, and may yet occur, in the heavens, though ancient systems may be dissolved, and new systems evolved out of their ruins, the molecules out of which these systems are built, the foundation-stones of the material universe, remain unbroken and unworn.' Here is a guarantee for the eternity of atoms from one who must confess that he never isolated an atom, and that all he knows of its eternity must be the conjecture of his own mind. Can dogmatism go further? On certain scientific minds, too, the subjects of prayer and miracles exercise a fevering and exciting influence, so that they cannot, after demolishing them, leave them on one side, and do their proper work. Against science, true to its aims, and modest in pursuing them, not a word should be said. The names of Faraday and John Phillips, departed from us, are beautiful to the memory in this connection. Many a living name lies ready, but we must not select. Nor would we attribute to Professor Tyndall any motive other than a love of truth, which all who know him attribute to him. But the atomic theory is but a poor gospel; and if men are to part with all their traditional motives, all their future hopes, and receive in return a dogma as arbitrary as any that the medieval Church is chargeable with, that Molecules are the Eternal, we question very much whether the interests of the molecules are so important to most people as to furnish them with a spring of action or a motive of life. We can even conceive it possible that, satisfied of the permanence of the molecules, an intelligent disciple might be the more disposed for some very ugly and sudden form of social change. We even think that this lesson has been clearly recorded and red-lettered on the page of history.

Between the imperishable Atom and the infallible Unit, social institutions are destined to sustain severe trials. This country has hitherto been lightly visited; but there is no hope of a complete escape. The papacy has been from the beginning antagonistic to political order. Claiming authority over all things, and jealous of all modern developments, her very attitude is hostile to states as they are. We feel it in Ireland; the Germans know it in Germany; the Spaniards in Spain. As for science, we do not pretend that she never can supply new motives in place of the old ones she tries to take away; but if the powers that be are not ordained of God, but only developments of the eternal

eternal molecule, we do not find as yet any serious attempt to give mankind some strong motives for social order instead. Science at present lacks authority. Ask the colliers of Durham and Staffordshire to adjust their claim for wages by political economy, and you will find that when the scale is rising they are willing to abide by it; but when the tide turns, the laws are resisted to the utmost.

Now the thought and the mind of the world never can and never will kneel again at the feet of the Pope. Infallibility leaves itself no place for repentance, and the breach between Rome and the modern world is utter, is final. Nor can the modern world live without a religion; in the rarified atmosphere of the temple of the atoms, common spirits cannot breathe. Moreover, the two extremes draw further from each other, and are more utterly hostile. Between the Pope and the atoms, between superstition and unbelief, between denial of all science on one side, and the glorification of science on the other, mankind needs some refuge; and here the Church of England has a work to do. Identified with the social interests of the people, she has never opposed their improvement; she has taken a leading part in their education; she has afforded to science many of its best votaries; she is often charged with intolerance; but, compared with other religious bodies, her large and paternal toleration is conspicuous. The great truths of the Christian Creeds she has kept faithfully. She has been gaining by greater activity a deeper hold upon the affections of the people of late years. Her parochial organisation has been very favourable to the rural districts. Large masses of population can provide for their own instruction; the village is less self-helpful than the town. In every country place there is one educated man proclaiming the message of consolation, administering the sacraments, comforting the unhappy, making the death-bed less dark by consolation. With all her faults, her work of this kind has been immense. She makes no claim to crush the will of the layman that the priestly will may prevail; nor to chain up the conscience that blind obedience may take the place of free action. Against the confessional as a system she has set her face steadfastly. And now, when her work is prospered the most, and her line of action stands clear before her, the same fanaticism that prevails everywhere else, is invading her. She is invited to get up a pale and feeble imitation of Rome; of course without Rome's discipline. In order to revive some show of the mass, and some imitation of the confessional, a party in her pale is prepared to risk all disorder and to employ all forms of slander and disobedience. It is vital to the whole Church that this  
should

should cease. The Church cannot do her work till it ceases. The pretence that this party has a monopoly of work in the Church is now pretty well understood. There are amongst them good, bad, and indifferent, as in other parties; and of the best it may be said that they would have worked better if they had worked in loyal obedience to their own Church without trying to bring her nearer to another. In Acts of Parliament as instruments of a great reform, we have not much faith; but from the general tenor of this year's proceedings, much good may come. In 'the great catholic revival,' the nation has taken no part. It has not had the effect that its authors hoped for. Its very lawlessness made it weak; for God is not the author of confusion but of peace. Looking out upon the stormy waste, from the tower that God has still made so strong, the Church of England sees enough of perils without, and of works of virtue to be done, to awe her into peace, and to restore a substantial unity of spirit in the overmastering unity of aim and work. For wielding safely free social institutions, which have repeatedly broken down in other hands, England is now the admiration of the world. It is possible yet that she may establish a greater title to admiration, in a Church able to raise and refine the national life, instead of sourly condemning its ideas and strivings; in a Church tolerant towards other religious bodies, but clear and definite in its own teaching; in a Church where charity of thought and speech is something more than a lesson to teach school-children, is an active principle for clergy and laity alike.

---

NOTE UPON THE ARTICLE 'PRIMITIVE MAN—TYLOR AND LUBBOCK,' in No. 273.

We have received the following letter for publication :—

SIR,

Trinity College, Cambridge,  
7th August, 1874.

In the July number of the 'Quarterly Review' of the present year reference is made on p. 70, in the article entitled 'Primitive Man—Tylor and Lubbock,' to an essay by me, published in the 'Contemporary Review,' for August 1873, and entitled 'On Beneficial Restrictions to Liberty of Marriage.' The passage is as follows :—

'Elsewhere (pp. 424-5) he (Mr. George Darwin) speaks in an approving strain of the most oppressive laws, and of the encouragement of vice to check population. There is no sexual criminality of Pagan days that might not be defended on the principles advocated by the school to which this writer belongs. This repulsive phenomenon affords a fresh demonstration of what France of the Regency, and Pagan Rome long ago, demonstrated; namely, how easily the most profound moral corruption can co-exist with the most varied appliances of a complex civilisation.'

The Reviewer thus asserts,—

*First*, that I approve of the encouragement of vice to check population, and of the most oppressive laws.

This I absolutely deny.

These pages (424-5) form part of a merely historical sketch of the various marriage customs and laws which have obtained at various times and places. The sketch is prefaced by a distinct statement that the facts are merely given historically. The laws and customs referred to by the Reviewer are those of the early German communistic bodies, and considerable prominence was given to them on account of their extraordinary nature and barbarity.

*Secondly*, he asserts that there is no hideous sexual criminality which might not be defended on the principles advocated by such as myself.

I deny that there is any thought of word in my essay which could in any way lend itself to the support of the nameless crimes here referred to.

The reference to myself is moreover introduced by the statement that,—

'Now, however, marriage is the constant subject of attack, and unrestrained licentiousness *theoretically* justified.'

The whole object of my essay was to advocate the introduction of further regulations in our marriage laws; and the institution of marriage is attacked only in so far as that I maintained that certain changes therein are required.

Each of these charges is absolutely false and groundless.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE DARWIN.

*To the Editor of the Quarterly Review.*

---

Nothing could have been further from our intention than to tax Mr. Darwin personally (as he seems to have supposed) with the advocacy of laws or acts which he saw to be oppressive or vicious. We, therefore, most willingly accept his disclaimer, and are glad to find that he does not, in fact, apprehend the full tendency of the doctrines which he has helped to propagate. Nevertheless, we cannot allow that we have enunciated a single proposition which is either 'false' or 'groundless.' Mr. Darwin's own words are (p. 412): 'The object of this article is to point out how modern scientific doctrines may be expected in the future to affect the personal liberty of individuals in the matter of marriage.' That the mode in which they may be expected to affect 'liberty' and 'marriage' has his approval is manifest, since he tells us (p. 419): 'one may hope' for certain preliminary restrictions, and that (p. 420) 'we can only make a really successful attack by compelling the production, before marriage, of a clean bill of health in the party, and ultimately in his parents and ancestors.' He next considers the possibilities of future legislation, and, as a preliminary, enumerates various laws and customs which have already prevailed. But as he does not say a single word to intimate his disapproval or condemnation of them generally, we may be excused if we misapprehended his meaning as to certain of them, more especially as some of the practices (as for instance great facility of divorce) enumerated in the same pages are elsewhere expressly approved by him. Thus he remarks (p. 418): 'A next step, and one to my mind urgently demanded, is that insanity or idiocy should of itself form a ground of divorce,' adding that the 'patient, should he recover, would suffer in no other respect than does everyone who is forced by ill health to retire from any career which has been begun; although, of course, the necessary isolation of the parent from the children would be a peculiarly bitter blow.' Certainly it would be difficult to advocate legislation more oppressive and heartless than this. Mr. Darwin will not probably venture

venture to assert that the persons, whom his proposed legislation would debar from marriage, can be expected to lead a life of continency. We are confident that no unprejudiced person, certainly no Christian, can regard the approval of such laws and practices as anything less than an approval (however little intended) 'of the most oppressive laws, and of the encouragement of vice to check population.'

But the whole tone and tendency of the article is (as Mr. Darwin would probably be the last to deny) in harmony with the teaching of that school which, regarding temporal welfare as the one only end and material prosperity as the one only sanction, logically denies all absolute individual rights, asserting that man is essentially no better than the brutes, and may, like brutes, be treated in any way useful for material ends without regard to any Divine law. Mr. Darwin (p. 413) himself speaks of difficulty in carrying out such restrictions as he advocates, 'so long as the pernicious idea generally prevails that man alone of all animals is under personal and direct management of the Deity; and yet what believer in evolution can doubt that results as surprising might be effected in man, as are now seen in our horses, dogs, and cabbages?'

We would further remind Mr. Darwin that the words, 'there is no sexual criminality of Pagan days which might not be defended on the principles advocated by the school to which this writer belongs,' by no means imply that Mr. Darwin himself has in his essay defended such crimes. We expressly disown the interpretation which he puts upon our words. We spoke of the school, and not of an individual. But when a writer, according to his own confession, comes before the public 'to attack the institution of marriage,' even though it be 'only in so far as that certain changes therein are required' (such changes being, in our opinion, fatal in their tendency), he must expect searching criticism; and, without implying that Mr. Darwin has in 'thought' or 'word' approved of anything which he wishes to disclaim, we must still maintain that the doctrines which he advocates are most dangerous and pernicious.









